STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
3 0144 00488719 6

THE

BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOLUME IV.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY BENJAMIN H. GREENE,
124 WASHINGTON STREET.
1841.

CAMBRIDGE PRESS:
METCALF, TORRY, AND BALLOU.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IV.

No. XIII.

ART. I. — Conversations with a Radical. By a Conservative. 1

ART. II. — The Times, — Past, Present, and Future. Factions, Religious and Political. The English System and Catholicism. The English System in America. Democracy. Its Tendency. Result. - - - 41

ART. III. — Our Future Policy. — The Policy to be pursued hereafter by the Friends of the Constitution, and of Equal Rights. - - - - - - - - - 68

ART. IV. — Address to the Workingmen. - - - - - 112

ART. V. — LITERARY NOTICES. — Social Destiny of Man, &c. By Albert Brisbane. — Woman and her Master. By Lady Morgan. — History of the United States. By George Bancroft. — The Dial. Nos. I. and II. — Grandfather's Chair, &c. By Nathaniel Hawthorne. — Emancipation. By William E. Channing. — The Rhode Island Book. By Anne C. Lynch. — Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit. By S. T. Coleridge. — Airs of Palestine, &c. By John Pierpont. — Essay on Washington, &c. By M. Guizot. - - - - - - - - 127

No. XIV.

ART. I. — Conversations with a Radical. By a Conservative. 137

ART. II. — The Laboring Classes in the Age of Chivalry. 183

ART. III. — The works of Charles Lamb, to which are prefixed his Letters, and a sketch of his Life, by THOMAS NOON TALFOURD. - - - - - - 214

ART. IV. — Distribution and the Public Lands - - - 230

ART. V. — LITERARY NOTICES. — Night and Morning. A Novel. By Bulwer. — Essays. By R. W. Emerson. — General History of the world, from the Earliest Times, until the year 1831. By Charles Von Rotteck, LL. D. Translated from the German, and continued to 1840. By Frederick Jones, A. M. — A Year's Life. By James Russell Lowell. — The Hour and the Man. By Harriet Martineau. — Récits des Temps Mérovingiens précédés de Considerations sur l'Histoire de France. Par Augustin Thierry. — Letter to the Editors of the Lowell Offering. - - - - - - - - - 256

ART. I. — Social Evils, and their Remedy. - - - - 265

ART. II. — Essays. By R. W. EMERSON. - - - - 291

ART. III. — The Secret of the Lord is with them that fear him. A Discourse. By the EDITOR. - - - 308

69247

No. XV.

ART. IV. — Catholicism, — Democracy in America. Part Second. The Social Influence of Democracy. By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. - - - - - 320
ART. V. — Truth is not a Lie, — The Religion of Nature Delineated. - - - - - - - - - 339
ART. VI. — Executive Patronage. — Address to the People of the United States. By JOHN TYLER. - - - 353
ART. VII. — The President's Message — Message to the two Houses of Congress. June 1. By the President of the United States. - - - - - - - - 371
ART. VIII. — LITERARY NOTICES. — Hereditary Property Justified. — Reply to Brownson's Article on the Laboring Classes. — Names and Titles of the Lord Jesus Christ. By Charles Spear. - - - - - - 390

No. XVI.

ART. I. — Shelley's Poetical Works — 1. The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley. Edited by MRS. SHELLEY. — 2. Essays, Letters from Abroad, Translations and Fragments, by Percy Bysshe Shelley. Edited by MRS. SHELLEY. - - - - - - - - - 393
ART. II. — Transient and Permanent in Christianity. — A Discourse on the Transient and Permanent in Christianity, preached at the Ordination of Mr. Charles C. Shackford, in the Hawes-Place Church in South Boston. May 19, 1841. By THEODORE PARKER. - - 436
ART. III. — The Citizen-Soldier. — The Character, Duties, and Qualifications of the Citizen-Soldier. — An Address, July 4, 1841. - - - - - - - 475
ART. IV. — Orphic Sayings. — Orphic Sayings. By A. BRONSON ALCOTT. - - - - - - - 492
ART. V. — Mr. Fourier's Social System. — Letter from Mr. Brisbane in Reply to the Editor's Remarks on Mr. Fourier's System. - - - - - - - - 494
ART. VI. — Bancroft's History. — History of the Colonization of the United States. By GEORGE BANCROFT. - - 512
ART. VII. — LITERARY NOTICES. — 1. Hyperion, a Romance. By H. W. Longfellow. — 2. Voices of the Night. By H. W. Longfellow. — The Methodist Quarterly Review, Vol. I. Nos. 1, 2. — The Philosophy of Storms. By James P. Espy, A. M. — Facts of Mesmerism, or Animal Magnetism. By the Rev. Chauncy Hare Townsend, A. M. — The Book of the Indians, &c. By S. G. Drake. — Confessions of an English Opium Eater. — The Science of Government founded on Natural Law. By Clinton Roosevelt. — An Exegesis of English Syntax. By James Brown. — Editor's Notice. 518

THE

BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1841.

Art. I. — *Conversations with a Radical.* By a Conservative.

My attention was arrested one day, during a short residence in a Western city, by a crowd collected before the principal hotel. Wedging my way into the crowd, I soon discovered that the object of attention was a coarsely clad fellow, holding forth to the multitude from the very top of his lungs. He appeared to be speaking under strong excitement. He gesticulated rapidly and with violence. His tones were harsh and bitter; his looks were wild and haggard; and his whole figure and manner indicated a madman, or a person uttering himself on a subject, which absorbed the whole energy of his soul.

"Ye make us beasts of burden;" were the first words I could make out. "Ye call yourselves the higher orders, because ye can task the labors of the poor and wretched. Ye are the higher orders, are ye, because ye wear fine clothes, have long purses, live in spendid palaces, and recline on soft couches; because ye have large estates, well cultivated fields, rich harvests, groaning granaries, and crowded store-houses? By whose labor are ye what ye call yourselves? By your own? 'T is false. 'T is by the labor of those

ye call the lower class, on whose rights, feelings, and interests ye trample every moment, and for whom ye care less than ye care for your oxen or your horses. Ye strut and swell with a boasted superiority, do ye? Know ye not that ye purchase it by the tears of the widow, the wrongs of the orphan, and the blood of those ye should have loved as ye love yourselves?

"The higher orders, are ye? Ay, for ye make men carry you on their shoulders; ay, for ye ride on the backs of those of your fellow beings who have too much honesty, or too much simplicity, to be riders themselves. And now, forsooth, ye raise a terrible hue and cry because we, whom ye have ridden for ages, show ourselves a little restive and unwilling to stand ready bitted and saddled, for you to vault upon our backs, and plunge your rowels deep into our flanks. Order is in danger, is it, because the horse learns his strength and turns upon his rider? Society is to be dissolved, is it, because your oppression is to end? Vain are your threats; vain are your pictures of mobocracy and anarchy; ye shall be unhorsed. We have sworn it in the depths of our souls, on the altars of our country, in the presence of our God. We will carry you no longer. Use your own limbs. Ye may as well go on foot as we. Go build your own houses, cultivate your own fields, make your own tools, man your own ships, work your own engines. Ye may as well do it for yourselves, as that we should be poor and ignorant in order to do it for you. No longer will we toil, and sweat, and suffer, that ye may enjoy, or be corrupted by wealth and luxury. The higher orders, are ye? puling babes, miserable victims of your own avarice or extravagance, worshippers of fashion, men forsworn, who study only to profit by the labors of others! The higher orders, are ye? Go then and form a nation of higher orders, a nation apart by yourselves, and see how long ye will maintain your elevation."

As he uttered these last words in a tone, which one must have heard, in order to form any conception of

its provokingness, a stone, sent from no unskilful hand, struck him on the side of the head, and knocked him senseless to the ground. "Good!" shouted the multitude, and dispersed to their several places of business. Though provoked by the fellow's radical nonsense, and uncalled-for declamation, I ran to ascertain the effects of the blow, and to see whether any assistance was possible or needed. I found him stunned, but not seriously injured. It is no easy matter to kill an enthusiast. His body is so completely under the control of the spirit, and so saturated with it, that it becomes itself all but spiritual and impassible. I had him conducted to my lodgings, where all needed assistance was rendered him. In a few hours he was perfectly recovered, except a slight contusion on his head, from which, however, he assured me he suffered no pain.

I have not a spice of radicalism in my nature. It is true, I was a poor boy, and that for some years I had a hard struggle; but now, all my habits, my interests, and, I may add, my convictions, are with the Conservatives. I do not feel it my duty to set up for a Reformer, to be wiser than all who went before me, than most of my contemporaries. I am not yet capable of so much arrogance. I am content to follow on in "the path my forefathers trod." I have aimed to check whatever tendencies I may possibly have had towards enthusiasm, and I am in general as cold and as immovable as the granite hills of my own New-England. Yet this ranting street orator affected me, and made me wish to examine him at my leisure. He struck me as a riddle, but also as a riddle worth the reading. Perhaps there is something in lofty enthusiasm, in the power of self-sacrifice, in a disposition, that goes straight to its object, regardless of difficulties, or dangers, or death, however mistimed or misplaced, which cannot be witnessed with indifference; something perhaps to warm the coldest hearts, and agitate minds the best disciplined. No philosopher seems able to offer a more convincing argument for his system than to die for it. Samson destroyed more of his enemies

by his death, than by his life; and the early Christians conquered the world by dying for it.

There was another reason why I wished to examine this fellow, who was the incarnation of Radicalism. Radicalism was rife in my native city. It was threatening everything with destruction. Insubordination was becoming universal. Strikes and combinations, and trades' unions, were paving the way for a return to the savage state. Property was becoming insecure, and there was no foreseeing what the sovereign mob might not, one day, take it into its head to do. Perhaps it would even go so far as to propose a division of property, and to distribute among the idle and vicious the fruits of the labors of the industrious and the virtuous. I wished to make myself thoroughly acquainted with the character, designs, resources, and expectations of Radicalism. This fellow, whom chance had thrown in my way, might instruct me. I therefore urged him to spend a few days with me, which he readily consented to do, as he was one of those who go about doing *good* when they have not where to lay their heads. During his stay with me, we ran over a great variety of topics, some of which we discussed with a little closeness and depth, and others we merely touched upon. The principal results of our intercourse and discussions, are contained in the following Conversations, which were written down immediately after, and as nearly as they occurred, as possible. If I have not in all cases refuted his mischievous notions, it must be borne in mind, that my chief object was not to show my own argumentative powers, — which those who know me will admit to be not contemptible, — nor to vindicate my own doctrines; but to draw out the Radical, and make myself, if possible, acquainted with his inmost soul. My friends, I am sure, will agree with me, that his notions in general need no refutation. I soon perceived that his conversion to rationality was hopeless, and I ceased to attempt it. Whatever I said was intended to give him an opportunity to express his opinions.

One by reading these Conversations will hardly form an adequate conception of the Radical as he really appeared. Sometimes, his manner was courteous, his tones were bland, and he showed clearly that he had seen good society; at other times, his voice was harsh, and his whole manner coarse and revolting. There were times when the proudest and firmest mupt have quailed beneath the withering scorn of his look, and the biting sarcasm of his tones; times there were too, when he seemed inspired, and you felt that you were in the presence of a God-ordained prophet. He was a mystery. Whether hate, envy, spleen, or love, high undying philanthropy governed him, I could never satisfy myself; and the only conclusion to which I have been able to arrive is, that he was intended for a great man, but disappointment, misfortune, struggles with the world, and perhaps ill health, had affected his brain, and that at the time I saw him, he was in need of a strait jacket. Perhaps, however, I am mistaken. Let those who peruse the following Conversations judge for themselves. Let them determine whether he should be reverenced as a prophet, dreaded as a devil incarnate, or confined as a madman.

CONVERSATION I.

C. That was a saucy fellow who threw that stone at your head; had he killed you, as I was afraid he had, I should have deemed it a disgrace to my country.

R. If my blood could redeem my brethren, and restore them to their long lost, and long forgotten rights, freely would I pour it out like water.

C. You use strong language, but I see nothing to warrant it. This is the land of freedom, of equal rights, where man is man and nothing more. We open the road to merit alone; and if some obtain richer prizes than others, it is because they are more deserving. Really, Sir, I see no cause of excitement, or even complaint.

R. You are pleasant.

C. Not at all. I never treat with lightness that which is a matter of gravity with another. But I cannot avoid believing him, who complains in this blessed country, a grumbler by nature, or else out of his wits. We are all substantially equal.

R. Equal! pray, Sir, where have you lived?

C. With my countrymen, who have at times reposed some little confidence in me, and whom I have endeavored to serve according to the measure of my ability.

R. You are in easy circumstances?

C. I am not what is called poor.

R. You have leisure to ride about and see the country, to view the beauties and wonders of nature, the miracles of art and science, to cultivate your taste and enrich your mind with ancient and modern lore?

C. Through the goodness of God, who has prospered me, I have something of this.

R. And your friends and associates are among the fashionable and polite, the educated and refined, persons belonging to the upper classes, with leisure like yourself, taste, habits, and pursuits similar to your own?

C. I rarely choose my friends from the vicious and vulgar.

R. You can take your choice of schools and teachers, give your children the best education afforded by the country, and a vantage ground on commencing their active career in life?

C. I am thankful that I can.

R. And these advantages are worth something in your estimation?

C. I certainly prize them very highly.

R. How large a proportion of our whole population, do you suppose, possess the same or similar advantages?

C. Probably not more than one in a hundred.

R. Yet we are all substantially equal!

C. Not precisely equal, I admit; but we are as nearly so as is possible or desirable.

R. I know not that. I know not where the possible ends, or the impossible begins. A greater degree

of equality *you* indeed may not desire; but what will say the ninety and nine who are not so favored as you are?

C. There are indeed always some malignant spirits to envy the prosperous, and to declaim against the virtue which is above them. Such may desire a greater degree of equality, as the rascal with the halter round his neck, may desire the abolition of capital punishment.

R. The ninety and nine, whom God, according to your reckoning, has not seen fit to favor as much as he has you, will no doubt feel obliged to you for likening them to the rascal with a halter round his neck, declaiming against hanging. You, who are at the top of society, are very apt to think that your opinions and your wishes are the only ones worth regarding; and you think that you have a perfect right to sneer at the views and wishes of those who are at its base. But the time has gone by when you could sneer with impunity. From time out of mind we have looked up to you as oracles; we have received your decisions as those of a god. When you told us, that it was necessary that some should be rich and reverenced, and that others should be poor, miserable, despised, and trampled on, we believed you, and submitted to our hard fate. It did not occur to us, that the advice you gave us was the advice of the rider to his horse. But now we understand you. We know the value of your opinions. When you tell us no more equality is desirable, we immediately ask ourselves, whether you ride or are ridden; whether you are those who reap all the benefits of society, or those who bear all its burdens. It is pleasant to ride, but hardly so to be ridden. It is very pleasant to reap the benefits, but not quite so pleasant to submit to the labor of producing them for others.

C. But who can better judge of the value of the social system as it is, than they who are the most enlightened, and whose elevated position enables them to see it as a whole, and to mark all its workings?

R. The master would no doubt tell his slave, who

should question the justice or utility of slavery, that his position was too low to see its beauties. It is only the master, who stands on the slave's shoulders, that can see the excellency of slavery. So, only you, who are at the topmost round of the social ladder, are raised high enough to see the beauty and excellence of the present order of things. But, if we are not high enough to see its beauty and excellence, we are low enough to feel its weight, and to suffer from its injustice; and we know not why we should bear this oppressive weight, and endure this injustice, merely that you alone may be elevated, and be freed from all burdens, and have nothing to do but to praise the system of things from which you alone profit. We are the many; our interests are as sacred in our eyes as yours are in yours; we desire a greater degree of equality, and as we are as ninety and nine to one, we can hardly be persuaded that what is desirable to us, is upon the whole undesirable.

C. You labor under a grevious mistake. It is for the benefit of the low that some should be above them. Those who are up, help raise those who are down.

R. Admirable way indeed to raise a man, that of planting your feet on his shoulders! Be so good as to step off of our shoulders, and we will get up of ourselves.

C. The upper classes do not stand on the shoulders of the lower. This is all fancy on your part.

R. On what then do they stand? What keeps them up? Where there are several strata, one lying above another, I have always supposed the one above rested for its support on the one below.

C. In physics you may be right, but in moral science things are different. The upper classes rest on their own merit.

R. Very modest! Not content with depriving us of the fruits of our labors, you would monopolize all the merit in God's universe! Moderate your pretensions. Merit, moral merit, is confined to no stratum of socie-

ty; but may be found in all, and as often in the lowest as in the highest; in the hovel as in the palace; clad in rags as in embroidery. But enough of this. Even you, notwithstanding your social position, I trust, retain some of the feelings of the man, and even you, I believe, if you would take an impartial survey of society as it is, would admit, that more equality than now obtains, is desirable.

C. I have seen society; I think I know what it is.

R. You have seen it from a lofty position, and at a distance; come now and view it nearer by, and from a lower position. Down here, in these valleys, are many things which you may not have seen, or which you may have forgotten, or not considered. Go with me along our public works, our unfinished railroads and canals, and observe attentively this mass of abject beings whose labor constructs them. The contractors, who grow rich by working them as the teamster works his horses or his oxen, no doubt delights in their abjectness, for were they less abject, or were there fewer of them, he would be obliged to treat them better and pay them more wages, and perhaps be unable to hire them at all. Mark them, Sir, kicked and knocked about by those petty tyrants, called overseers, and tell me if you see no distance between them and the nabob corporator, which it would be desirable to lessen?

C. You speak of foreigners. The old World annually disgorges upon us her thousands and tens of thousands of vagabonds. I wish it could be prevented.

R. These vagabonds, as you call them, are human beings; and human beings, wherever born, and whatever be the color of their fate or their skin, are to me not foreigners, but fellow citizens and brethren. But leave them; they are mostly Irish, and we are yet hardly able to reckon the Irish within the pale of Humanity. Go into your factories — you may be a factory owner for aught I know — go into your factories and mark those pale-visaged girls chained to the spindle or the loom, growing "part and parcel" of the machinery on which they tend, and the bare mention

of whom would make the wives and daughters of the factory owners turn up their noses, and tell me if you desire no greater degree of equality than now exists between those pale-visaged girls, and the up-nose-turning wives and daughters of the factory owners? Or go into your cities, into the back streets, dark lanes and blind courts, the damp cellars and unventilated garrets, crowded with human beings incrusted with filth and wallowing in the mire; and then go and view the mansions of the rich, fronting our broad, clean, and airy streets or open public squares; and tell me honestly if you see no more inequality than you deem desirable?

C. That there are some degraded and suffering beings among us, I do not mean to deny; but their own vice and folly, ignorance or crime, make them so. Nobody need be poor and miserable in this country.

R. Nor in any other. I thank you for the admission. If none need be poor and miserable, what mean you when you say a greater degree of equality is impossible? I had hoped to find you too clear-headed to fall into a contradiction so common. You tell me — as almost every man tells me — that a greater degree of equality is neither possible nor desirable; when I point you to instances which you connot see without having all the better part of your nature cry out for more equality,— instances of poverty which it is shocking to behold and painful to remember, — you relieve yourself by saying, this poverty, though not desirable, is unnecessary; it originates in the ignorance or depravity of the poor. That you may not feel any qualms of conscience for living in luxury while others are suffering for the necessaries of life, you assert that they suffer through their own fault, and that they need not be so poor. But in asserting this, you admit the possibility of producing a greater degree of equality. According to your own account, poverty then, is not necessary. Then it may be removed; then a greater degree of equality is possible.

C. I mean a greater degree of equality is impracti-

cable. We might indeed divide all the property of the community equally among all its members; but three days would not elapse before some one would dispose of his share to another, and the old inequality would soon be reproduced, and in an aggravated form.

R. Admit this; it only shows that the method, you mention, is not the right method for introducing equality.

C. But, Sir, there have always been the poor, and there always will be, and the sooner we come to this conclusion the better.

R. If it comes to prophesying, I may as well prophesy as you; I have as good a right to prophesy good as you have to prophesy evil. Poverty, you say, will never be cured; it requires not a little prophetic power to be able to look far enough into futurity to be certain of that.

C. "The poor ye have always with you," said Jesus, and Moses assures us they "shall never cease out of the land." Whatever you may say of my prophetic power, I hope you will not call in question that of Moses and Jesus. God has in the depths of his own wisdom ordained poverty. I consider poverty an appointment, an express and beneficent appointment of God.

R. Then go and give away what you have, and be poor.

C. It is my duty to take care of what God has entrusted to my keeping.

R. And so thought, I presume, the young man who came to Jesus to inquire what he should do to inherit eternal life. It is easy for you to say that poverty is a beneficent appointment of God; for in one sense it is beneficent to *you;* you could not be rich if others were not poor. It is their poverty that makes your wealth. You can have wealth and leisure, because there are many poor to labor for you. But is poverty a beneficent appointment to the *poor?* Do you believe it! Why then have you ransacked heaven and earth, fire and water, sea and land to

become rich? Do you believe it! Why then do you submit to the self-denial of being rich, and to the care of your huge estate? Do you believe it! Go then and take the place of him who is kicked from good society, because he wears a thread-bare coat and a sun-burnt face, who is made the common drudge, who must bear all the burdens of society, minister to the wants of the rich, and be despised and trampled on for it; go place yourself by the side of that poor mother weeping over her naked, freezing, starving children, and enduring the agony of a thousand deaths, as she sees them drop piecemeal into the grave; and then talk of poverty as a beneficent appointment of God!

C. You are warm. Poverty is a blessed means to prepare its subjects for another world.

R. What then, shall become of the rich? Do you believe this? How then do you hope to prepare yourself for another world? Shame on your base hypocrisy! Poverty a blessed means to prepare its subjects for another world! Did you not but now charge the poverty of the poor to their indolence, their vice, and their crime? Are indolence, vice, and crime the true preparations for heaven? Is he, whose every thought is racked to devise means to support the human animal, passing under the best discipline to prepare him for Heaven? Away with such nonsense. It has already done injury enough to religion. You and your allies, the priests, have so effectually charged the sufferings we endure upon God, that they have succeeded in filling the land with Atheism. Has the poor man complained of poverty; happy is the poor man, for though poor and miserable here, he is sure of heaven hereafter, it is replied; and the priest pockets his tithe, and the tyrant sits secure on his throne.

CONVERSATION II.

C. You have evidently received a superior education, and yet I find you the very incarnation of Radicalism. This to me is a mystery.

R. Why so? Is there any necessary incongruity between a good education, and a sincere devotion to the interests of mankind,—an unquenchable thirst to promote the well-being of the poor and the neglected?

C. Perhaps not. But I have not been accustomed to look for Radicals among the educated.

R. Nor anybody else that knows anything. Still, education has no higher or holier vocation than that of fitting its subjects to be stern, uncompromising, and indefatigable Reformers. But the educated among us belong to the more favored classes, and the more favored classes are always opposed to Reform, or — if it suit you better — to Innovation. A part of the educated owe their superior education to the fact, that they belong by birth to the more favored classes; and the rest are placed in the category of the more favored classes by the fact, that they are educated. In either case, whether educated because their fathers were rich, or whether poor boys who have contrived to get an education, they then belong to the aristocracy. And why should the aristocracy be Reformers? What have they to allege against society as it is, since they have it altogether their own way; since it is altogether in their interest? A man like yourself has few inducements to be a Reformer; you can hope to gain nothing by a Reform. Bred to regard only yourself, inured by the habits of your life, and the circumstances in which you have been placed, to a selfishness all but diabolical, tolerating no upshootings of the soul for the happiness of your fellow-beings, incapable of looking for, or tasting pleasure in doing them good, what can make you engage in the grand and glorious work of social regeneration? The man who blacks your boots and brushes your coat might engage in the work of Reform, and the poor woman stewing over your kitchen fire preparing you a luxurious dinner, or a late supper, from the ill effects of which you will never recover, may be a Radical. But not you; — you have nothing to gain. You have drawn the highest prize; you have won the stake,

and why hazard another game? You may lose, but you have nothing to hope from further winnings. You are now at the top of the social ladder. A change may place you at its foot. This is the case with nearly all the educated — or if it be not the case with all, each one trusts that it will be in a few days — and can you then wonder that so few of them are Radicals? It is not because they are too wise, but because they have too great a stake in the existing order.

Nor is this all. Our young men, who receive a superior education, are not educated to regard the well-being of Humanity, to be Reformers, the champions and servants of the people; but they are educated to get their living out of the people. None of our colleges or higher seminaries imbue our young men with an unquenchable zeal for human improvement, kindle up in their hearts a burning desire to set mankind forward, a disinterested love which weds itself to the cause of Humanity, and pursues it through good report and through evil report, and never in the darkest hours relaxes its exertions. They train up our sons to manage the people skilfully, and to ride them gracefully and securely. Our professors are mere riding masters, giving lessons in the noble art of horsemanship. No man can be a Professor unless he be an aristocrat or a conservative.

C. Why not?

R. Because our colleges and higher seminaries are founded by the wealthy, and are under the control of those whom the present order of things most favors, and because these will choose no man to be a professor, unless he be one in whom they can confide. They can confide in no man who is in favor of any social changes, innovations, or improvements. They are men of the present, whom the present most favors, and they must naturally distrust all who do not in return favor the present. Moreover, to be chosen a professor a man must be a popular man. But the men, who are devoted to the highest and most enduring interests of mankind, are never popular. He who has

the misfortune to think in advance of his contemporaries, and to desire a good for mankind beyond that already attained, is necessarily unpopular. If he venture to translate his thoughts into words, and his hopes into actions, he will be branded a jacobin, an agrarian, a leveller, an anarchist, or at best, a visionary, who, though he may mean well, is to be pitied, not trusted. Men who have faith in the future, whose mental vision sweeps a broader than the vulgar horizon, whose souls burn to raise up the low, to break the fetters of the slave, to open the prison doors to them that are bound, to preach glad tidings to the poor, hope to the desponding, consolation to the sorrowing, and life to the dead, must always count on being discarded by their own age and country. They cannot but be misinterpreted. They cannot but pass for what they are not, and would abhor to be. And how is it possible, that such men should be chosen to superintend the education of our children?

To be popular one must be a man of the present, uphold things as they are, never disturb the world with new views, but merely echo the sentiments he finds in vogue. He who can echo these the loudest, and with the greatest distinctness, is sure to be the most popular. Such men never trouble their age; they disturb no one's prejudices, excite no alarm, produce no commotion. Such men always look for in colleges, and therefore never look to colleges for Reformers, for new ideas, or for encouragement to labor in the cause of mankind. New ideas are placed in the world by those whom the world knows not, or whom it disowns if it knows them. Reforms come from the obscure and the unheeded; from a peasant and his fishermen followers, not from the popular and the honored. The weak things of this world are chosen to confound the mighty, and foolish things to bring to nought the wisdom of the wise.

C. You do not appear to hold popular men in very high esteem.

R. Not I. That is, if you mean by popular men those whom everybody praises, whose name is in every-

body's mouth, and whom their own age holds up as worthy of all imitation. I for one, claim no affinity with such men, and stay as short a time in their presence as possible. I am not of their parish. I cannot hurrah with the multitude, when they pass by, or deign to make a speech. God knows I do not envy, but pity them. Poor creatures! It is their fate to live and die without ever having felt the throe of a single idea, and without the consolation of having contributed aught to the movement of the race. With the present, pass away the popular men after whom the multitude now run; and as yesterday is swallowed up in to-day, so will they be lost in the generation to come, and be remembered no more forever. The future will preserve of the men now living only those who have had some forecast of that which is to come, and shooting by their own generation, have dared live, and labor, and suffer, for posterity.

C. You talk strangely for a Radical. I have always supposed a Radical a mere compound of envy and malignity.

R. And may you live long enough to repent of your error. What is there in this world to envy! I have seen all that it has to offer; I have tasted of all that, which the many pursue as their chief good. I know what it is to be honored, and eulogized, to be rich and courted, to have my name in the gazette, and made the theme of the orator and the bard. It is all vanity. Wealth, fame, pleasure, pomp, place, power, — they are mere shadows. I look with pity ou him who sighs after them, and with unaffected sorrow on him whom they encumber. Poor things! bask in your little hour of sunshine; make the most of its warmth, for an eternal winter of neglect and forgetfulness awaits you. Could I envy, it should be none but a Socrates drinking his hemlock, a Paul brought before Nero, a Vane at his prayers on the scaffold. I know not but I might envy the martyr burning at the stake, for religion, for country, for justice, for unswerving devotion to truth, duty, God, man; but I can conceive of nothing else in this world to envy. But enough of this.

To return to education. Our colleges and higher seminaries are not only instituted by, but for, the more favored classes. These classes — and you attest it — are always, taken collectively, conservative. They seek no social progress. They think, if we can keep things from growing worse, we shall do well to be satisfied. They therefore steadily oppose all radical changes in the social system. Details may be modified, but the ground-work must not be touched. The rough fetters of the slave, which eat into his flesh, may be polished or converted into fetters of gold; but they must not be broken. This or that poor widow may be relieved, and the great body of the poor may have the priest come and tell them, that if they will be quiet and patient here, never seeking to unhorse their riders, they shall go to heaven hereafter; but the poor, as a body, must not be elevated, and above all, must one beware how he proposes the complete and entire removal of poverty. These classes allow us to plead with all our might for the poor as individuals, for they are charitable and humane, but they forbid us under severe penalties to adopt effectual measures for the removal of the evils under which they labor. They permit us to give alms, but not to remove the necessity of almsgiving. They would mitigate the pain, for they do not delight to inflict suffering, they would mollify, but never heal the wound. This being the character of the more favored classes touching the point in question, and their character presented in its best light, is it reasonable to ask them to commit the education of their children to the care of men, who have full faith in the practicability of removing all social evils, and who would do their best to communicate that faith to their pupils? I need not ask you, if you would choose a man of my opinions to be the educator of your children; for I know you would not. You would not send your children to a college of which I could be a president. My radicalism alone, without any other consideration, would prevent you from doing it. The same principle, which in this case governs you, would

govern the whole of your class. I know you all. You have no wish to have your children educated to be Reformers, because you have no faith in nor desire for Reform yourselves. You have the instinct of self-preservation. You are not likely to be suicides; and yet it were suicidal for you to encourage Reformers; for they would reform the abuses by which you are made the more favored class. Reform would deprive you of all your exclusive privileges. You would be obliged to black your own boots, sweep your own chimneys, and in all cases perform your own drudgery. Not willingly will you consent to this. You do not choose to be your own servants, and you will not be, so long as you can find others who will be servants to you; and not till you consent to be your own servants, will you consent to sustain professors who aim to prepare your children for the work of perfecting the social organization. As things now are, professors, who desire to perfect the social organization, must leave their professorships, or withhold their own convictions. If they choose to retain their chairs, they must consent to support the existing order of things; lecture in favor of order, not liberty; against anarchy, not against tyranny; and labor to send out every year an army of young conservatives, prepared to put down all tendencies to philanthropic enthusiasm, to crush every effort of the people to meliorate their condition and to perfect society; not an army of reformers, trained to their work, and able to bring science, and literature, and taste, and genius, and religion to their aid, and prepared to die, if need be, in obtaining for the human race an advanced position. No; they must wither the holiest affections, and chill the noblest aspirations of the young heart, and send it out dead and cold.

The same influence corrupts our literature and renders it hostile to democracy. Few things are more to be deplored by a true American, than what passes for American literature. It is tame and servile, so servile that it might excite the derision of an Asiatic despot. Scarcely a writer among us dares utter an

original thought, or breathe a noble aspiration. No writers have a more sovereign dread of Radicalism, than American writers. With what contempt must those Europeans, who are enlightened, and who understand that America stands pledged to what you call Radicalism, turn over the leaves of our popular Reviews and Magazines! And how discouraging indeed, must it be to the friends of Humanity in other countries, the noble spirits who plead with ignorance, combat prejudice, and struggle with the tyrant, to listen in vain for a cheering and strengthening word from America, the boasted land of the free! That word they hear not. Let not the Reformers in other lands look to us for sympathy. Our sympathies are not with the friends of truth, freedom, justice. Our writers are the faint echos of the hired defenders of priests, kings, and nobility. The world is cursed with few periodicals,—so far as they have any character,—more strictly anti-radical and purely conservative than the New-York and North American Reviews. Even Blackwood and the London Quarterly are less so. The New-York Review is rescued from contempt, because it has courage enough to avow its real character; but the North American hardly ever dares say, good Lord or good devil, though it has a manifest longing to say good devil, having, I presume, a presentiment that it must fall into his hands at last.* We sometimes complain that the old world does not respect us. Let us cease to complain, and study to deserve respect, by being true to our principles. No object is more contemptible than a democratic people apologizing for their democracy, and trying all possible methods to resemble those who are cursed with monarchies. *America will never be respected till she is worthy of respect, and never will she be worthy of respect, till she shall be true to herself, and dare avow and*

---

* This abuse of the North American Review is very unchristian. We can bear witness that this Review never intentionally offends God, man, or the devil, and therefore should not be so abused.—EDITOR.

defend the doctrine of equality on which her institutions are founded. She must have a Literature in harmony with the rights of man; and her writers, must draw from minds that have been formed in schools of equality, and from hearts that are large enough to embrace the whole family of man, and keep them warm. Man and man only must be able to kindle their enthusiasm, and inspire their strains. They must rise above all factitious distinctions, be able to pierce beneath every garb, to discover the Incarnate God though clad in rags. They must dare speak out from full minds and hearts, their free thoughts, and give them to us with all the freshness and vigor with which they come to themselves; and to send out their feelings as warm as they gush up in their own hearts, if they would make her respectable in the eyes of those whose respect is worth having.

This is not the case now, and the reason why it is not, is obvious. Aside from the newspaper press, at present our only hope, all our literature is designed for the wealthy and educated, for the American aristocracy. I have told you the character of this aristocracy. It has no stars, no coronets; but it has the exclusive spirit which pervades all aristocracies, less of liberality than the aristocracies of the old world, because its tenure is less secure, and because each member of it knows that it is possible he may to-morrow be at the lowest depth of the people. They who write for this aristocracy, must write to suit its views and prejudices. Most of our books, our Quarterlies, and our Monthlies, are designed for this portion of the community, and hence their conservative character. Let one of our Quarterlies admit an article which goes for the many instead of the few, and the few who are its supporters will at once stop their subscriptions. Without subscriptions the periodical cannot be continued, and subscriptions it cannot have unless it appeal to the exclusive interests of those who are expected to patronize it. Publishers have then their option, either to appeal to that exclusive interest, or to stop publishing.

A book written in the interests of Humanity, full of rich thoughts and noble sentiments, expressed in a style of classic elegance and purity, and with a power almost superhuman, will find few purchasers beyond the ranks of the workingmen, and even the workingmen, prone to take their cue from their supposed betters, will not venture to approve it. In this way nearly all the advantages of a free press are lost. Some of the best minds among us are silent, because they can find no medium through which they can utter their thoughts. A mind conscious of great wealth, of high and generous aims, noble and kindling thoughts, will not consent to pare itself down to a saleable size in the book stall. It must be allowed to speak out, and speak out freely in its own way, and its own burning words, or it will not speak at all. How much is lost by the miserable censorship, which a sickly public opinion establishes over the American press, for which our whole nation "must fare the worse," God only knows. And how many of the noblest and most gifted of our contemporaries lock up their thoughts in their own bosoms, and die because they cannot utter themselves, is a secret which will be known at the day of judgment. Our press is muzzled, because no book can be published unless it find a publisher, and if it contain an Idea, a publisher it will hardly find; because the bookseller will be afraid that the Idea will render it unpopular, and therefore unsaleable.

The pulpit is gagged in the same way. Clergymen are in some instances from the conservative class, in all cases their education, habits, and associations, tend to identify them with the aristocracy. They thus catch the aristocratic tone of thought and feeling. Restricted in their own studies principally to their professions, they depend on the better educated and wealthier members of their congregations, for their views of political economy and the social state, and consequently must adopt, even with the best intentions, conservative notions. This is not, however, true

of all. Some of them see the truth; but then how mighty are the temptations with which they are surrounded to conceal it! The clergyman depends on the aristocracy for friends and supporters; to receive the friendship and support of the aristocracy he must enter into their views, and support their interests. If he do not please the aristocracy of his parish, he may be dismissed supperless to bed; or sent out into the world, with a wife and children depending on him for support, and he not a penny in pocket, or in reputation with which to support them. To preach the Gospel in these times, and in this country,—that is, to preach it as it should be preached,—one should have the spirit of martyrdom, be prepared to live alone in the world, to be looked upon with distrust wherever he goes, to be called a visionary, or a fanatic, to be familiar with poverty, to be harassed in body and in mind, to die of disappointment and grief, and leave behind a helpless widow and friendless orphans. If he would avoid this, he must temporize, form an alliance between Christ and Belial, God and Mammon, and beware how he touches a new idea. New ideas will render him unpopular. If unpopular, he cannot collect an audience; if he cannot collect an audience, he can have no salary; and if no salary, he must cease to preach, or starve. They who hold the purse, therefore, virtually write his sermons. In a vast majority of cases the clergyman is but a speaking machine, from which the aristocracy grind out just such discourses as best please them.

These views, Sir, which doubtless are very pleasing and encouraging to you conservatives, are very saddening to me. My heart is oppressed and filled with grief. O, my countrymen,—and yet why complain? No man, who does not uphold the present, though he have a heart that would take in the whole family of man, and a mind, that with a prophet's ken, sees the future and what it demands, can obtain a hearing from his contemporaries. His own generation know him not; they neither see nor hear him. They know not how

much rich thought, how much disinterested love, what power to do and dare anything and everything for human regeneration, there may be in that heart, into which they look not, and which they will not suffer to be laid open to them. When the man of new views, the reformer, is dead, men will build him a tomb, or garnish his sepulchre; but so long as he lives they leave him to be — stoned. Yet let me not "bate a jot of heart or hope," but bear on my way. Mankind, thou canst be saved only by crucified redeemers. Ay, it is so. The Cross is the true symbol of regeneration. He, who will go forth to defend the right, to plead for the poor and the neglected, the oppressed and the enslaved, must take up his cross and follow Jesus. He, who condemns the present, — and he, who demands reform, does condemn it, — must be himself condemned in return. The present attacks those by whom it is attacked. They are wolves in sheep's clothing, they, the pretended reformers, who find wind and tide in their favor, and whose bark is wafted gently forward by the breath of popular applause. The future is elaborated in the present; but its elaborators must work in dark laboratories, silent retreats, or subterranean caverns, unseen, unknown, unvisited, uncheered, unaided. It cannot be otherwise. Christ must needs suffer. They are of the future, and the future must be their reward. Their views, their ideas, their wishes, their hopes are dark mysteries to their contemporaries. They are the prophets of a new age. The world is not worthy of them. There is no world for them. They must be the builders as well as the heralds of their own world. And while they seem to those around them but the mere pullers-down of the world, in which they appear, but to which they belong not, how can they excite any other shout than that of "crucify them, crucify them."

And yet the cross is sometimes all but too heavy to be borne, and the firmest and stoutest faint beneath its weight. O, it is bitter to be cursed with thoughts beyond your age, to see truths invisible to all eyes but your own, to be compelled to utter prophecies you

know will not be credited, to be alone in the thronged city, a stranger in the home of your childhood, and amid faces familiar to you from your youth up. O this is a solitude in which a man agonizes, sweats as it were great drops of blood! Mankind, thou little knowest what it costs to save thee from thyself. No matter. Thou deservest to have martyrs, for thou art the child of God. But why talk I in this strain? you understand me not. I talk mysticism, fanaticism, or barbarism to your comprehension.

C. You are right now. All this stuff about what the Reformer suffers is all foolishness to me.

R. And so, Sir, must be all great truths, and pure philanthropy, and lofty enthusiasm, to you and to such as you. When you have felt a desire for human happiness, for the progress of mankind, so strong that you could not sleep; when you have given years of intense study to the means of doing good, and sacrificed wealth, ease, reputation, friends, and found yourself alone, considered by one a madman, and by another an imp of hell, and found that after all your exertions, no man understands you, no bosom responds with sympathy to the holy love struggling in your own, and that you must after all die, without having finished your work; then you may sneer at the Reformer, and call what he says foolishness; till then be silent, lest you be found blaspheming God.

CONVERSATION III.

C. There is no ground for the distinction of which you speak. We are all workingmen. The lawyer, the physician, the clergyman, the merchant, the statesman, the philosopher works as hard, perhaps harder, than your ploughman, your ditcher, your carpenter, shoemaker, or blacksmith.

R. Admitted; but the difference is this, one class works to produce, the other class works to secure for itself the proceeds of the other's producing. The community is divided into two classes; one class,

which I denominate the workingmen, are producers, the other class are accumulators, of wealth. The first class create wealth, the second transfer it to their own pockets.

C. But there is one thing which you Radicals seem always to overlook. You either cannot or will not regard the aid which the producers receive from the skill, science, enterprise, and capital of those you call the accumulators. Your producers would be in a sad box, if they were deprived of the capital of the accumulators, and of their science to direct their mere brute labor. The labor of those heads, which to you seem idle, is doing more than all the labor of the hands of your producers, to facilitate the work of production.

R. But production for whom? These accumulators with their capital and their head-work, I know, multiply productions far exceeding in amount anything we could do by our mere hand-work; but who secure the profits? You, and all the economists with whom I am acquainted, seem to take it for granted, that the well-being of the producer is always in exact proportion to the amount of production; and they would be right, if every man produced for himself; but as things now are they are most sadly mistaken. The accumulators study to employ their science and capital in that manner which will give them the greatest profit; that is, so that they may derive the greatest possible amount of production from the labors of the producers. The advantages, to which you allude, then, of increased production, are advantages almost exclusively to the accumulators.

C. In point of fact, you are greatly out in your reckoning. The expense of manufacturing a yard of calico bears no comparison with what it was fifty years ago. A similar change has taken place in the expense of producing almost all the articles consumed by the common laborer; and do you mean to tell me the laborer has gained nothing by this cheapness of production, and this low price he has to pay for whatever he consumes? The laboring classes are in a condition

almost immeasurably above that in which they were at the epoch of our Revolution. To be assured of this, you need but compare the price of labor with that of bread stuffs then, and the price of labor with that of bread stuffs now. You may also be convinced of this by observing the houses, dress, and style of living of laborers now, which in many respects are superior to what those of the rich were then.

R. This mode of judging is fallacious. That there has been a general increase of wealth throughout the civilized world for the last forty or fifty years, nobody is fool enough to deny. Man's empire over Nature, during this period, has been greatly extended and consolidated; the powers of production of all kinds, as well as productions themselves, have been so multiplied as to baffle all efforts at calculation. The laboring classes most certainly account many things necessaries of life now, which they then accounted its luxuries. But they are not the less poor. Poverty and wealth are merely relative terms. The only true method of judging of this matter is to ascertain whether the position of the producer, relatively to that of the accumulator, be higher or lower, than it was at the epoch of the Revolution, before the marvellous powers of machinery, of science, and capital had been made to bear on production, as they have been since. Grant that a yard of calico may be purchased now at an eighth of what it cost fifty years ago; what is gained, if in order to maintain the same relative social position, the blacksmith's wife must put seven yards more into her gown, or have eight gowns to one then? You know, Sir, if you know anything about it, that, notwithstanding the general advance of wealth and the vast multiplication of the necessaries and conveniences of life, it is altogether more difficult for the common laborer to maintain the same social position now, than it was fifty years ago. The general style of living has more than kept pace with the increase of wealth. The mechanic, it may be, receives two and even three times as much, nominally, for his labor now as he did then, and is required

to pay two or three times less for what he purchases; but then he must have as much more as this difference implies in order to be a man of the same consequence that he was. The blacksmith's wife must have a carpet now, where a nicely sanded floor was enough then; and a French calico instead of a homemade, copperas-dyed, tow-and-linen gown, which was her pride then. Then she could spin and weave, and with butternut bark, dye her husband a coat from the wool he received for blacksmithing; but now she can only do some fine needlework, and he can wear only broadcloth; both of which things demand corresponding changes in the style of living.

C. And I should suppose that with your great affection for blacksmiths, and especially for blacksmiths' wives, you would rejoice that it is so.

R. No. My friends, the blacksmith and his wife, the shoemaker and his wife, the housewright, and the wheelright and their wives, are all poorer than they were. Their houses may look better outwardly, but they are not so comfortable inside. They have more compared with what they then had, but less compared with what is now the general style of living. The sanded floor, the copperas gown, the checked apron, the butternut coat, and tow shirt, frock, and trowsers, were good enough for them then, for they were as good as their neighbor's had. Some little vanity or uneasiness might now and then be occasioned by the quality, the skill of the housewife in making, in dying, or in fitting, but it amounted to very little. Each family manufactured for itself, and felt itself independent; and the feeling of independence, that we have within ourselves the means of providing for our own wants, is worth more than all the carpets, French calicoes, French silk, satin, lace, and the like things in the world. Those were happy times. Labor was no disgrace, for all labored; and homespun was no badge of inferiority, for all wore it. I remember how delighted I used to be when I was a boy, at evening, to seat myself on the dye-tub, which stood in the

corner, and hear the maid, who was doing our spinning, accompany the music of her wheel with such old songs as "Jemmy and Nancy," and "the Cruelties of Barbara Allen." I have heard some famous singers in my day; but no songs have ever charmed me like those old songs sung by our neighbor's daughter who did our spinning. What though she had but one calico gown for Sunday; what though that was often turned and altered to look unfaded and to be within hailing distance of the fashion; and what though she worked for forty cents a week, and had no gilt album or souvenir lying in her boudoir? She had health and cheerfulness, bloom on her cheek, an elastic bound in her step, heartiness in her laugh, witchery in her smile, and — was as good as any of us. It was no disgrace that "she went out to work." No young spark made any account of that. At all gatherings and merry-makings, her head was as high as any one's, and her chance for a worthy and respectable companion was as good as hers who never worked in or out of her father's house. Nobody complained of bad servants. The daughters of the best families would go and help the poorest, if they could be spared from home. Thus was it in one of thy mountain towns, my native State, in my young days. Then the hearts of thy children were as fresh as the verdure of thy mountains, and their spirits as free as the winds that sweep over them. I have seen many countries; I have visited lands most renowned in song or story; I have lived in cities, consorted with the great, and wedged my way into the charmed circles of the fashionable; but give me back the mountain home of my childhood, and let me hear again the wheel, and our neighbor's eldest daughter accompany the music of her spinning with the old songs of "Jemmy and Nancy," and "The Cruelties of Barbara Allen." In that home I was made a freeman. I drew in a love of equality with the milk from my mother's breast. There I learned to look on man, to see the man and not his clothes; and for this I bless thee, my native State.

Fame gives thee credit for no great men, but I know thou hast a great people, and my old Geography yet reads, and I hope not in vain, "Vermont is an independent State."

Forgive me, Sir, for this allusion to my native State, and to the home of my chilhood. That home is changed now. The same blue sky bends over it, the same golden sun sheds its beams upon it; but old faces have gone, old manners have given way. The summer's stock of cloth no longer lies bleaching on the grass plat before the door; my sister is not there with her water-pot; and to the sound of the water-fall, and the spinning-maid's song, has succeeded the endless clack of the cotton mill.

C. You are a strange Radical. I knew not before that Radicals ever thought of the Past save to condemn it. I have always supposed that they had eyes only for the Future.

R. That is, you have supposed we were only half-men. This is a mistake. For my part, I love the ancient and the time-hallowed. I delight to stand on spots renowned in story; amid the fragments of earlier worlds, to conjure up the dread Spirit of the mighty Past, and question him concerning those who were, but are not. I never had even a cane that I had carried for a long time, a knife which had done me good service, that I could lose without a pang. But I have learned to sacrifice the Poetical to the Useful. I love the old oak which yet stands by the home of my childhood, under whose shade I have so often played when life was full, and by which I whispered the tale of my earliest and truest love; but I would cut it down sooner than I would see my children freeze, or want fuel to cook their food.

C. Then you would not really destroy our factories, demolish all our labor-saving machinery, and go back to the hand-cards, the hand-loom, the spinning-wheel, the spinning-maid, and the songs of Jemmy and Nancy and the Cruelties of Barbara Allen!

R. Not I. I would never go back. If I some-

times give a tear to the Past, it is never to evoke it from its tomb. No. Let it rest in peace. The Past which is revived is never the Past which lives in our memories. It is only the ideal Past that is venerable. Those old songs would not please me now. The bloom is no longer on the maiden's cheek who bounded at her wheel, and gone is the mischief from her eye, and the witchery from her smile. We have lost the religion of our youth. The fairies no longer keep holiday on the green knoll in the pasture, or pinch the milkmaid because she stints our supper. But I do not regret it. All changes in the end are proved to be steps forward in the march of Humanity. Yet the step we have taken during the last fifty years is shorter than we pretend. We have changed the mode of production; for our neighbor's daughter, who used to do my mother's spinning and weaving, who nursed her in her confinement, and who was one of us, good as the best in the neighborhood, we have now the pale and sickly factory girl, who must up at the ringing of a bell, eat and sleep at the ringing of a bell, obey the whistle of a petty overseer, never leave her jail limits without permission, and whose average working life is only about four years. The one was our equal, whom the sons of our best farmers were willing and often glad to marry, and the other can get her a husband among the factory population perhaps — but rarely elsewhere. She is only a *factory* girl, and you know what that means. And surely here is some loss,— a loss of health, cheerfulness, freedom, and social position; and what is gained to balance this loss? At best two dollars a week instead of forty cents, and which two dollars does less to satisfy her wants, than the forty cents did to satisfy the wants of the one who did our spinning. The difference between these two girls is the difference between the working classes of our country fifty years ago and now.

Yet, improvements have been effected, important inventions have been made and labor-saving machine-

ry introduced which abridges labor many thousand fold. As soon as the producers can so arrange matters as to produce for themselves, they will reap the full advantage of this labor-saving machinery, and of the increased capital of the country. At present they receive no direct profit from either. The accumulators reap the profits. This discloses the true aim of the Radical. His aim is not to produce equality in property, nor in anything else, but to make every man a proprietor, so that the producer and the accumulator shall always be united in the same person. To this point, I would have governments direct their attention; all the friends of the people should keep it in view, and all Legislative and educational measures should tend to it.

C. You have now stated your object clearly. I must think of it. And to-morrow I hope you will get the better of your sentimentalism, so far at least as not to talk nonsense.

CONVERSATION IV.

C. Your plan is more plausible than sound, and appears much better in theory than it will appear in practice. Division of labor is essential to the very existence of society. But your plan requires every man to do everything for himself.

R. Not at all. The shoemaker may stick to his last, and the blacksmith may work at his forge. All the division in labor now recognised, may continue under the regulation, that every man works for himself, as well as under our present arrangement. The only division of labor to which I object, is that which assigns the head-work to one part of the community, and the hand-work to another. Since man is both soul and body, I would have no division of body-work and soul-work. Both should be as inseparable as soul and body. In the present state of things all the soul-work devolves on a distinct class of the community, and they are treated as though they were all soul; all the body-

work falls to another class, and they are treated as though they were all body. But this is unnatural and unjust. The body-workers have souls as well as the soul-workers. They who do our hand-work are of the same order of being with those who do our head-work.

C. That is true. But still, it is a very great advantage to the hand-workers, to have the aid of the head-workers. This you Radicals seem to overlook. You complain bitterly, that those who work with their heads are rewarded for their labor. You are not willing to give any share of the fruits of hand-work to him, who by his inventions has given to your hands a hundred fold their natural strength. Brute labor is all that you seem to regard as worthy of compensation. The philosopher, the naturalist, the mechanician, the painter, the poet, the sculptor, the musician, soul-workers as they are, must not be paid for their labors, though without their labors, life would be hardly worth possessing.

R. Stop there, if you please. You mistake us greatly. We would have all these soul-workers paid. But soul-work always pays itself. If these soul-workers could have wherewithal to provide for the body, while they were at work with the soul, it would be all that they would demand. No man, who pursued his profession for the sake of money, was ever yet a great philosopher, or a great artist. My rule is, that soul must pay for soul, and body for body. I object to an exchange of the products of the one for those of the other. At present, necessity may demand the unholy barter; but when society becomes what it should be, it will be discontinued.

C. How then are these soul-workers, as you call them, to live? Are we to have no men of science, no philosophers, no artists?

R. Millions to one in comparison with what we now have, I hope; but you seem very slow of apprehension. I would have every man labor for himself on his own capital, and then every man would have the time to produce all that is needed for the body; and also as much as can be devoted with any degree of advantage to moral, intellectual, and æsthetical pursuits.

C. Are you sure of that?

R. Some nice calculators have ascertained that if all men would labor, each three hours a day, they would produce all the material goods which they would need, or which could be enjoyed by the body. Now any physiologist will tell you, that three hours' labor a day is no more than is needed for the health of the body; and any man, who has any acquaintance with mental pursuits, will assure you that six hours a day are as much as any man can profitably devote to them. He, who labors three hours a day and studies six, will make much greater progress, than he who studies nine and labors none at all. This would leave every man fifteen hours a day for refreshment, social intercourse, and sleep. Under such an arrangement, you see, every man would be able to devote all the time necessary to head-work, — to science, philosophy, poetry, music, painting, or sculpture. There would then be no need of a separate class for these pursuits, to be paid out of the hand-work of the rest.

C. I suppose then you would not pay the clergy, physicians, lawyers, nor public officers?

R. No. They would need no pay. Each one would give three hours a day to labor as a matter of exercise, for health; and that would produce him all he would need for his body. His other labors being mental, would be recompensed by a mental reward. Besides, in this case, clergymen would not be needed; every man would know the Lord for himself, and be his own priest. Physicians would hardly be needed; for temperance and proper exercise would maintain almost uninterrupted health. Lawyers would not be in much request; for roguery would then hardly exist, and public officers would have but little employment.

C. Upon my word, you are a beautiful dreamer! And how do you expect to realize this dream?

R. As I have told you, by having every man do his own hand-work and head-work.

C. And you suppose the workingmen, mere brute

laborers, can become intellectual beings, philosophers, learned men, artists.

R. Why not? Are not we of the same order of being with those who think themselves above us? We care not with what contempt they look upon us, nor how contemptuously they sneer at our hopes for the future: we know that our bosoms burn, and our eyes sparkle with a fire as pure and as eternal as that which they bid us worship in their idol temples. Of the dust of the earth we indeed are, and down-trodden to the dust too we long have been; but we are also the offspring of God, and upward to our Father and our native heaven we may rise.

C. You have, for six thousand years, given brave proofs of your celestial origin! One would think that in so long a series of ages your inward fire might have been kindled into a blaze.

> *R* Full many a gem of purest ray serene
> The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
> Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
> And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

And beware, Sir, how you add insult to injury. You put out our eyes and reproach us for our blindness; make us blind and then tell us we shall tumble into the ditch, unless we have somebody to lead us. In our mother's arms the fire of intellect is smothered, and you and your caste keep watch by us ready to dash on your pail-fulls of cold water whenever a symptom of its revival is discovered. Now that we have been kept in ignorance, deprived of the means of developing our powers, and obliged to conceal the God laboring in our breasts under the veil of idiotcy, you have the effrontery to mock us because we are not philosophers, and to tell us that we must work hard to pay you for your great condescension in thinking for us; and you might add, for condescending to be happy for us. Base hypocrites! We understand you. We will not trust you to do our thinking; for we are suspicious, that your thinking is much more to your profit than to ours. Your thinking for us amounts

to little else than how to make us work to the best advantage, while you shall pocket the proceeds. You are fond of extolling the importance of head-work; but, as we have learned, that you may contrive to get your living without working at all. For you do not think as much, nor do you turn out to be such profound thinkers, as you pretend. Most of the discoveries of which you boast, and inventions and improvements in the arts of production, from which you derive so much profit, are the result of *our* thinking; and nearly all the individuals, who have saved your body from putrefaction, have been supplied from our ranks. We comprehend you; and hereafter will endeavor to do our own thinking; and if we think not so much to your interest us you have done, we may think perhaps more to our own, which will be still better.

C. In most of your remarks you labor under a mistake. You seem to believe that there is a class in this country hostile to the workingmen, seeking to circumvent them, and to keep them from rising. All this is mere fancy. I can speak for myself, and I think for all of those whom you brand as aristocrats, that nothing would give them or me more sincere pleasure than to see the workingmen all in comfortable circumstances. We have no pleasure in poverty, no delight in seeing, and certainly none in causing human suffering. You do us great injustice, and you do a serious injury to the workingmen themselves. You stir up their jealousies, excite their hostility against those you call the accumulators, and throw the whole community into a state of intestine war. Now this is no way to bring about a reform. The rich are necessary to the poor, and the poor are necessary to the rich, and as the friend of either class, you should seek to make both live together as brothers.

R. The lamb is necessary to the wolf; for without the lamb the wolf might want a dinner; and the wolf is necessary to the lamb, for without the wolf the lamb might fail to be eaten. "Therefore," says the benevolent wolf to the lamb, "do not be hostile to

us, nor excite your brother lambs against us; for you see we wolves and you lambs are mutually necessary to each other. We are as dependent on you for something to eat, as you are on us to be eaten." "But I don't want to be eaten," exclaims the lamb in great trepidation. "Not want to be eaten!" replies the wolf. "Now that 's odd. You and I are very far from thinking alike, and I must needs consider you very unreasonable, and radical in your mode of thinking."

C. Do you mean to call the rich wolves?

R. Apply my comparison as you please. All I mean is that the reasoning of the wolf appears to me as conclusive and every whit as just as yours.

C. I anticipated nothing of this from you, who evidently have had the means of knowing better. Some ignorant workingman might have been pardoned for talking so, but you, whoever or whatever you are, have seen too much of the rich to believe any such thing as you assert. You must have some base and sinister purpose in supporting the workingmen. You have some personal pique to gratify, and I no longer believe you honest but mistaken, as I did at first.

R. As you please. I profess to have no control over your opinions. You are not the first man whom the truth has offended, and will not be the last. But be cool. Now I know the rich; I know the accumulators of wealth in this country and in most others, and it is because I know them that I speak as I do.

C. If you continue to talk thus, I must break off the conversation, and relieve myself of your company.

R. As it suits your pleasure. I neither court nor avoid any man. But listen a moment. Now I have not the most distant suspicion that there is a class among us that wishes to keep down the workingmen, or that wills their poverty. The rich have no disposition to injure the poor. They are not hostile to the poor. The wolf does not by any means dislike the lamb, or wish to injure it. He only wants a dinner, and lamb is his most agreeable food. He loves lamb most affectionately.

C. No more of that, Sir.

R. Well, well, Sir, I see you do not like the comparison; you probably are afraid of the consequences. The wolf —

C. I tell you I will hear no more of that.

R. Very well, Sir. I only wanted to say that, the wolf might be afraid, if the lambs should once know that they were necessary to the wolf only for the purpose of furnishing him dinners, and that he was necessary to them only for the purpose of eating them, that they might, as they probably have no great desire to be eaten, combine against him, and thus leave him to feed on something else; but as it is disagreeable to you, I won't say it. And besides the wolf must be very foolish to apprehend any danger from a combination among the lambs. What could they do against the wolf? By combining they would only give him an opportunity to make his dinner on the fattest instead of the leanest. But seriously, Sir, your talk about the necessity of the rich to the poor is all a humbug, and fully justifies my comparison. The poor are necessary to the rich, I admit; but that the rich are necessary to the poor, I deny; and you know they are not, as you testify by your dread of my saying so. It is out of no love to the poor, no tender regard for their welfare, that you wish to have it understood that the rich are necessary to them.

C. You seem to think that we are a set of selfish wretches, who detest the poor and do all we can to make them miserable.

R. No, I do not. I acquit you of all hostility to the poor. I am even willing to admit that you have a certain affection for them, and would do your best to preserve and multiply them.

C. Come, cease your pleasantry, and speak seriously.

R. I am serious, and speak with all the truthfulness I can command. The wolf certainly has no disposition to destroy the race of lambs. Nor do I blame the wolf for making his dinner of lamb. It is his nature to do it. Nor do I blame the accumulator for transfer-

ring the profits of the workingman's labor into his own pockets. It is his nature to do it. He could not be an accumulator if he did not. What I complain of is that there are wolves, or accumulators of wealth, separate from the producers of wealth. In sober earnest, you can assign but two reasons why the rich are necessary to the poor; one reason is that they may be the *instructors of the poor*, and the other that *they may give them employment.* Have you any other reasons to allege?

C. Those are enough.

R. But we have disposed of these already, by contending that the poor should do their own thinking, and also work for themselves. There is no good reason in the world to be assigned, why one class of the community should be dependent on another for its instructors. The whole community may and should be equally educated, and every man may and should work for himself. So long as the wealth of the community is in the hands of only a certain number of individuals; or, in other words, so long as the community is divided into two classes, one of which owns the funds, and the other of which must perform the labor of production, the poor are undoubtedly dependent on the rich for employment; and since without employment, the poor must beg, steal, or starve, the rich may be said to be necessary to them. But this is the precise evil I complain of in the present social arrangement of wealth and labor. Let each man become an independent proprietor, and then the rich would not be necessary to the poor, in order to give them employment, for each man could employ himself on his own capital, and instead of working for another he could work for himself.

C. Every man does work for himself now. I do not know what you mean by this senseless clatter about every man's working for himself on his own capital. Every man does so work now. One man's capital is his farm, his workshop, or his store and goods, another's his ability to labor, the strength and activity of his limbs. In the great copartnership of society

each man invests his capital, whatever it be, and receives his share of the gains. Some invest more than others, and therefore receive and ought to receive a proportionally larger share. You and I too form a copartnership when I employ you as a common laborer to plough, plant, hoe, or reap for me. You are not indeed an equal partner. Your investment is less than mine. You invest merely your bodily strength and activity, while I invest house, barn, out-houses, land, oxen, horses, sheep, and hogs, together with my own labor, bodily or mental. Now as my investment is more than yours, I ought to receive a larger portion of the gains. Your share is called your wages, and when you consider that in copartnerships of this kind, I have all the vexation and labor of superintending the joint concern, that I have to pay all the incidental expenses, run all the risk, and be responsible for all the debts, and to you also for your share, I think that you must admit that your wages amount to your full proportion. Certain it is, that many an employer would do well to exchange places with those he employs. They in fact often run away with all the gains, and seldom suffer when the concern is a losing one.

This matter of wages, about which workingmen have so much to say, is, after all, a thing beyond human control. A stern and unyielding necessity governs it. There is a natural ratio established between wages and the price of articles demanded for consumption, which no power on earth can alter. If wages rise, articles of consumption rise in the same proportion; if wages fall, then articles of consumption fall. Let the workingmen double their wages, and what they gain on the one hand they will find they lose on the other. They will have to pay double for everything they consume. When masons, and carpenters, and house-joiners rise in their wages, house-rent will rise; when house-rent rises real estate will rise in value, land will bear a higher price, and of course the productions of the soil. Flour must rise; the baker then will ask more for his loaf or make it lighter; and

when the shoemaker must pay more for his bread, he will charge more for his shoes, and so it will be with all the trades. This shows in a clear light the fallacy of Strikes, Trades' Unions, and all combinations of workingmen for higher wages, which are seldom successful; and when they are, amount to nothing. In the transition from one price to another, the trade which gets the start of the rest may gain something, but as soon as one trade rises, all the rest will rise, and then things are as they were before. When a day's work will buy a bushel of wheat, and only a bushel, it makes no difference whether you call the price of a day's work sixpence or five dollars.

Ignorance of this fact does great harm. Mechanics in our cities become uneasy, they spend a portion of their earnings in the grog-shops, in oyster-cellars, in houses of prostitution, or in theatres, and finding what remains too little for their necessary expenses, they cry out for more wages, put the business part of the community to great inconvenience, often embarrassing them seriously, and subjecting themselves to loss of time and of money, when even were they to succeed nothing would be gained. No, Sir; these things must be left to take care of themselves. The partner who has the smaller investment must not expect to share equally with him who has the larger, much less to possess himself, as the workingmen seem to desire, of all the profits of the firm. Let the workingmen limit their desires to what is their due, and they will have justice done them; but if they can be satisfied only by having their share, and that which belongs to the other members of the firm into the bargain, then I must for one resist them, and if I fail, society will fail to exist.

Sir, let me beseech you to bear this in mind. A laboring man's capital is his bodily strength and activity, a kind of capital which is essential to the copartnership, but which is only an item and a small item in the immense amount invested. What that is entitled to out of the general gains let him have. He

works on his own capital and has what he produces; with that let him be satisfied. Nobody wishes to wrong him. Tell him so, use your eloquence to persuade him to be virtuous, economical, to avoid haunts of dissipation, to keep clear of the theatre and bawdy-houses, and you will do him a real service and deserve well of the whole community. Then you would prove yourself the workingman's true friend. I beseech you to do so, and forbear to say or do aught to stir up the laboring classes against the rich. Your present language makes me believe you a dangerous man. I beseech you to use a different language hereafter.

Art. II. — *The Times, — Past, Present, and Future. Factions, Religious and Political. The English System and Catholicism. The English System in America. Democracy. Its Tendency. Result.*

Faction, or that species of political party which has no direct relation either to philosophical truth, or practical measures, has had a sort of festival triumph, in the recent general election, which may well terminate its deceptive and worthless career. An old, well known, though always an ephemeral spirit, has had another day's fluttering and revel. The vacant lust of conquest, which necessarily reduces political contests to mere efforts at official ascendency, has now done, it may be hoped, all it can do to corrupt the public mind, and expel from the current history of the time its rightful dignity. Politics, that, like religious feeling, should be the serious study of a free and intelligent people, has, under this pernicious influence, been made a mere sportive exersise, while its belligerent means have been contemptibly trifling. Citizens, free and sovereign by name, have for a few years past openly leagued together for specific partial

or selfish purposes; the two great parties of the country have been but agglomerations of small ones, and neither has had other than a remotely constructive relation to the fundamental principles of human difference and concord.

As factional religion, or *Sectarism* as it is sometimes called, early prostrated the power of the Reformation, and left the greater part of the civilized world unaffected by the new spirit, so has factional politics often interrupted, and long delayed the social regeneration of the world. The restless activity of mind must be employed; the individual passion for excitement must have its appropriate food, and men will ever rally under a false and deceptive banner when that of principle is furled. From this inherent frailty of human nature, acted upon by the artful misrepresentation of Truth, which is the handiwork of the missions of Injustice, have originated the whole class of local and transient revolutions, that grossly disfigure the history of the past; complicate and confuse the great current of consequential changes in the social condition of mankind, and render the Philosophy of Politics most difficult and profound.

Never since the beginning of evil have appearances more belied reality than at the present time. Peace is said to reign over the Earth, and yet everywhere, there is war in disguise; smothered indeed, or kept in a sort of half-way existence, by unintermitted and ever fluctuating diplomacy, but as grinding to the nations, and as foreign to repose and prosperity, as honest, open, and destructive battle. The United States are proclaimed free and independent, severed from all colonial relation to the Government of England, while we are quite as dependent upon, fully as tributary to, and as sensibly affected by her institutions as any one of her now existing colonies, or as we were before the declaration of our independence. The time was, when men did not greatly err in estimating the strength of

nations by the extent of their respective navies, and the numbers of their armies; but the systematic policy of Great Britain,—"the English System"—the concentration of the money-power of the world in London, in close affinity with the administration of her Government, is an overwhelming power that armies and navies cannot measure;—a power that has had no prototype in the world, save in that awful reign of terror which existed before the combined spiritual and temporal supremacy of Rome was overthrown by Luther and the Reformation.

The analogy between the old Pontifical Power and the present English System is closer than is generally supposed. If we but substitute the avarice of the one, for the superstition of the other; the ardent love of money, for the extreme fear of death and hell,—passions equally absorbing and all-controling in their dominion over men,—we may comprehend this analogy in its aggregate and details. False, corrupt, ingenious, magnificent, the two systems alike claim our hatred and admiration, and justify the shaking of the Earth itself for the riddance of the immense imposition. The wielding of the "spiritual power," when that power was exercised upon the extreme mental feebleness of the world, itself the product of art and design, and the concentration of that power at the Vatican, was not more oppressive, tyrannical, and unjust, than the corresponding control now exercised upon a wide basis of artificial poverty and cultivated meanness, emanating, through the arts and mysteries of commerce, from the Banking conclave of London. The funding and banking centres of the English policy may be aptly compared to those old, and now worn out institutions of the once predominant church, the ecclesiastical and monastic orders. As superior worth and *sanctity* were claimed by, and accorded to the old associations, so we find a similar worth and *wealth* accredited to the new; and as falsely in the one case as it ever was in the other. Ignatius Loyola, in founding the formidable

Society of the Jesuits, did but bank a vast portion of the superstition or belief of the world; and established for the members and their friends, an immense credit in social reputation, and unbounded influence over the temporal interests of men. The Inquisition, even when in the plenitude of its tyranny and abominations, did but make and break whom its capitalists listed; and dispensed the peculiar poverty of that time, as our money cheiftains do the peculiar poverty of ours. The worldly destinies of a freeman, deserving of independence, should be in the power of himself or his kind alone; but where is the man, nominally free or emphatically a slave, who does not obey the subtle and all-pervading influence of the monks of the Order of — Money!

It is a vague definition of civilized man to say he is an intelligent being, governed by opinions, which result in laws. Far better it is to respect history and experience, which prove he is governed by passion, which results in instability. Hope is inseparable from moral existence, and enthusiasm is the basis of energy and enterprise. The gaudy, mystified, and ever varying piety of former ages, signified nothing but a certain greedy and insatiable want in the human mind of something indefinitely extravagant. Accordingly, all modern history comprises little else than a series of successive public excitements, singularly incongruous and contrarious in their natures, but each, in its turn, claiming and obtaining the homage of the world. It would indeed seem as if nearly all the possible phases and combinations of intoxicated feelings had already reigned their time and passed into oblivion. Since Roman pride gave way before savage destructiveness, the world has been successively enslaved, the great popular mass cruelly degraded; *first*, by the devoted and captivating bravery of the Feudal ages, which wore itself out by extending beyond the sublime and running errant to the ridiculous; *secondly*, by the high-wrought organization of the Church, involving all the

machinery of Terror, and which, in its turn, exploded through the extreme refinement of its immunities and oppressions; *thirdly*, by the era of Glory in the long series of promiscuous wars growing out of the Reformation, generally unworthy in their origin and contemptible in their objects, and which, as the others, has become stale, flat, and unprofitable. It has well nigh wholly yielded to the *fourth* excitement, the organization of the Money Power; the contraction of all human interests within the circles of avarice and meanness; the glittering kingdom of commerce; the conversion of principles and feelings — of "men and the souls of men," into commodities of merchandise. An organization more delusive and oppressive to the many; more gratifying and exalting to the few, than any that have preceded it; but which, happily, contains in its very nature a rottenness and inevitable decline, that must soon transfer it among its kindred wonders of the Past. It must of necessity give way. The new social spirit, or reigning passion, which is to supplant it, is already born into existence. The passionate love of Liberty; the wild spirit of Democracy will, for a time, overspread, engross, and control all human society. In itself, not the, or any part of the millennium, but involving progress and reform; conclusive as to the dynasty of fictions, and the harbinger era of Peace and Reality.

The specific contest, then, in which the whole world is engaged, is the only one appropriate to the present time, — between the Money power and the Democratic. These are now the antagonist systems, and for the one or the other must every man contend. It is vain to attempt neutrality, or idly await the arrival of a better proposition than either of these involves. They and we are here upon the battle ground, without choice of time, or selection of opponents beyond the single alternative. Preference may, however, be in some measure governed by careful inquiry into the respective systems.

The Money Power, or "English system," so called, because its central home, or *point d'apui*, is evidently in the capital of England, contemplates success, *first*, by the perfection of its own machinery, and *secondly*, by preventing, or greatly retarding, the growth of the democratic spirit. Under the first head, it is assumed that London or England can become the exclusive home of the wealth, magnificence, and power of the world; while all other nations must become largely tributary to her, through the operations of her monetary system. Allowing to all other sections of the earth entire nominal independence, as far less expensive and troublesome to herself than their actual dependence, England has adopted the deep-laid scheme of over influencing foreign nations, by means of her own emissaries and minions in their midst. Like the pouring forth by the olden Romish power of hordes of indefatigable missionaries into distant governments, and thereby accomplishing the gradual, quiet, insidious subjugation of their people to the "spiritual supremacy," the whole world is now filled with interested and servile advocates of the English policy; and its total conversion, — equally quiet and insidious, — to the supremacy of wealth, is in frightful progress. It has ever been a customary species of lordly policy, — no matter what be the reigning passion, — for the purpose of obtaining influence, to induce the more humble to depend for their hope upon the superfluous means of others. The partaking of the concentrated holiness of the old Catholic Church, involved the abject subjection of the confiding individual. The subdivision of the glory of the Military Chieftains proved to be the total sacrifice of the common soldier; and in like manner, the *ideal good* of the present system is ingeniously diffused for the tribute and subjection of mankind. A hypocritical generosity is now ever ready to lend money to a moderately independent farmer, for the extension of his lands, or the renewal of his buildings; which generally terminates in the sacrifice of all he has. This common, old, and essentially dishonest process is the

elementary basis of the general policy of England. Vastly extended, and accurately systematized, it has become the mighty engine for founding universal empire; — a project, chimerical to sober reflection, but too fascinating to minds excited by avarice, not to be faithfully tried and ardently hoped for.

Many millions of wealth has England already thus invested in these United States alone. The apparent or ostensible amount is grossly deceptive. There is no possibility of estimating the loans she has made to private individuals and firms in business, or the extent of her interest, as at least silent or special partner, in the trade, manufactures, and even the real estate of the country. We well know, however, that the visible owners of these things exhibit all the anxiety in behalf of the English capitalists, that especial friends or partners can in any case do, and are evidently in some sort of associate interest with them. The manifest and great desire of the money missionaries, the English partners and stipendiaries among us, for vast schemes of expensive "internal improvements," and for the institution of banks and incorporations generally, means something, means much. England yearns to loan us money. Her system restrains her within no contracted limits. She has never yet had near scope enough to exhibit to us or the world, the full wonders and mysteries of her policy. So much of fiction, so much of mere empty appearance and trick are in the practical nature of these loans, that allow to English capital circulation enough; give it Jehu-like celerity, and a close observer would be amazed at the amplified fiscal properties of but a few millions of coin. Money, in large sums, may be said to possess a highly elastic property, by which it returns to its original home with a rapidity utterly incomprehensible to dealers in cents and farthings. The government of England owes her own capitalists nearly one thousand millions of pounds sterling, which she cannot and never will repay. Is her credit at all thereby impaired, or the means of her

moneyed men thereby crippled? Not at all. That immense debt has but resulted in a claim, by the rich few, of a vast annual income out of the taxes, — out of the labor of the country. It has become nothing more nor less than a peculiar pension list, peculiar only because negotiable in the market, while the basis of that debt, the same money, has been loaned over and over again, at home and abroad, without becoming in any degree impaired. Circulation, — including the theory and handiwork of exchanges, deposits, credits, drafts, paper obligations, &c., — is the corner stone of the fictitious and bloated wealth of England; that is to say, is the whole force of "the English system."

It is no new idea that the immense national debt of England has strengthened her Government; or, in other words, rivetted the chains of despotism upon her miserable and infatuated people; — thence the doctrine, so palpably consistent with the whole English system, that "a national debt is a national blessing." Conservative reliance has in all preceding epochs been reposed in some analogous and equally absurd fiction. In Catholic times, an enormous and thoroughly organized National Church, and in the reign of Glory, a huge and well disciplined army, respectively afforded this consolidated "blessing" of the individually wretched. There is truly nothing just now practicable, that can so effectually bind men or nations in ostensibly peaceful or commercial intercourse, as the relation of debtor and creditor, especially when deeply and permanently fixed, or when many individuals in a given section of society are similarly involved or interested. If we but imagine that in our own country *one third* of the population are indebted to England, by a complex series of primary, secondary, ternary, &c. obligation, which means hope of forbearance or farther indulgence, and duly appreciate the incomparably abject servitude of debt, we can comprehend something of the numbers, vast energy, and dreadfully threatening aspect of the *British political party* in our midst. To

assert that there are here already, directly and indirectly, so many as one third of the people, who are the confirmed subjects of the English system, may indeed be extravagant, and, if literally true, would be appalling. But to this end, and worse, must it come at last, unless met now, and perseveringly combatted to extinction, by all those who yet have the spirit as well as the name of freemen. Unitedly, in firm and compact mass, must the democracy of the land bear down upon the collective policy of England, as their one mighty and only important enemy, or the day of possible victory may pass away, and the dark night arrive in which no man can work.

It is not only from the emissaries and dependents of the British system that our liberties are in imminent danger: — there are among us chiefs as well as minions of the Money Power. Not a few of our citizens — and calling themselves Democratic Republicans! — with spurious patriotism and perverted judgment, would, at this late day, attempt to rival the commercial ascendency of England, and establish here at home the throne of the money god. Without reflecting that England has irrecoverably the start of us in the gambling game, or that the result must necessarily be horribly evil to mankind, no matter where be the central position of the machinery,— of no more consequence now, than the residence of the Popes at Rome or at Avignon was in the spiritual system — they still vainly hope for success by an unwieldy extension of the English policy. The result of their endeavors, after many years of trial, has very naturally been to second or aid, instead of to weaken or divert from, the foreign project. In this way did our peculiar banking system, and paper money circulation originate, and in this way have they well nigh terminated: — A business policy which has made this new and plentiful land, a "high prices" country; a region of extreme artificial inflation in all its social features; and which would early have exploded into thin air, or

indeed could never have had being, but for the vast recipient wilderness of the west, which has kindly received from our more commercial border a vast and continuous procession of the expelled and ruined. Were it not for this boundless and geographical resource, those who are put *hors du combat* in the incessant cutting and slashing of the wide and ungovernable fluctuations of our business relations, would long since have so clogged the humbler vocations of society, as to have rendered the whole people incomparably miserable. This resource, because it is geographical, is contingent or adventitious, and can have no favorable bearing upon the justice or expediency of our paper policy. Instead of being a motive to the adoption of, or perseverance in the system, it clearly shows it is wrong in its nature, and, if persisted in, must eventually prove the bane of our yet happy institutions. That nature herself has, as it were, come to our aid, with a comparatively free and exhaustless garner of sustenance, when we have so conducted as to be unable to sustain ourselves on her usual supplies to nations, surely indicates that we have defeated by public mismanagement, the ordinarily successful results of industry and skill. Notwithstanding the high nominal rates of wages and productions, our industrial classes — even the freeholding agriculturalists — exhibit to the moral observer that peculiar phenomenon of a poor and oppressed people — children and most endeared friends generally parting from parents and each other, to emigrate to distant regions of fairer promise; and to flee from a country already worn out, not surely by a single century of cultivation, but by a false system of public institutions: — a country fertile and favored, when abstractedly compared with any other on Earth, utb cursed by errors of monetary policy, while its population is yet sparse, and the half of its original forests yet unfelled.

There is no other possible meaning to a paper circulating medium, than the production of High Prices.

The whole scope, bearing, or philosophy of the American *pseudo* policy has been to create a highly excited condition of social intercourse, in which extreme vicissitude shall be the predominant feature. Accordingly, a reckless spirit of speculation and gambling already presides over, not only the personal vocations of our citizens, but coerces, or threatens to coerce all the social, political, and even religous relations of the community. This direful excitement of public character; — the accurate parallel of that high-wrought zeal, which, three hundred years ago, employed the torture, the stake, and the sword to control religious belief and conduct — compels all our people to roll within the vortex of its influence, and each one to do the like of all, or die. The system of High Prices involves the decree, that success in life shall attend those only who largely participate in the excessive activity — the maddened fury of the times. Plain, routinal industry; the honest desire to live modestly and peaceably, is identified with folly or imbecility; for the common law is imperious, to get rich, emigrate, or perish. This chief immoral consequence, apparent already in the yet imperfect stage, will, if the system be carried out to its legitimate extent, as but too many desire, eventually startle the moralist and the christian, by exemplifying the yet poetic ideas of demoniac character, and the wallowing of the damned in perpetual fire. This language involves no exaggeration; it is the true "likeness of the spirit" of high prices. If one but cursorily looks into the authentic histories of nations,— notwithstanding that, like almost all the literature of the world, its authors and publishers were ever, as they are now, under the pay or patronage of the aristocracy,— he will find abundant proofs of the desperate and abominable means, uniformly resorted to in all the high excitements of society, to attain to influence or greatness. The *whys* and *wherefores* of the accession of many of the Roman Emperors in ancient times, and of many even of the holy Popes in modern, sufficiently demonstrate that the full maturity of any specific and reigning passion, is re-

plete with public depravity. A similar result will inevitably attend the climax of the money reign, provided it goes on unchecked by revolution, when the merely questionable, or conventionally tolerated means now employed to become wealthy, will, by regular increments of ever growing obtuseness in the public moral sense, have given place to modes and schemes, at which, at this day, avowed gamblers would recoil, and society revolt with a marked unanimity. The philosophic mind has but to suppose the inflation of the paper system to the double of what it ever yet has been, and then reflect upon the immense consequent widening of social disparity between those who have something of the wealth of this world, and those who have nothing, and the whole proposition will be satisfactorily solved. The factitious multiplication of the property or capital of a country, is but the real augmentation of its poverty; for the influential position of man in society is altogether relative. Under the supposition our western states and Texas would indeed populate with a rapidity many times greater than at any former period, and be falsely adduced as evidence — clear as proofs of Holy Writ — of wonderous national prosperity, while we, here at home, might flatter ourselves with perhaps five dollars a day for ordinary labor, but in reality be poor indeed: the nation of the poor, wherein the least poor would be the wealthiest man; himself the abject vassal of a foreign Lord.

But, the intemperance or immorality of the High Prices system, may, unhappily, appear to many as a matter of little importance; more especially since a complacent *Theology* has kindly devised an altogether abstract hypothesis, for quieting the conscience in a worldly mind. To those, therefore, who see no heinous evil in the general moral degradation of society, the argument can be presented, with possibility of effect, only in connexion with the selfishness or interest of the public. Still, it must be remarked, that even in this point of view, moral degradation — a

spurious sense of weakness, and awe of conventional superiority — is at the very foundation of the poverty and endurance of the people. By this, as the first cause, we can alone account for the empty parade and the assumed grandeur of the ascendent few, and the tacit assent of the humbled many to the whole, or any specific part, of the vast fabric of imposition. Even the artful cultivation of petty and enfeebling jealousies, by the institution of innumerable little distinct sects and associations in general society, results in this one common antecedent of social evils, the humility of the mass. In fact, the great contest before us is, when expressed in the simplest terms, the collective powers of moral debasement, on the one side, and the self-respect of the many on the other. Nevertheless, it is clearly not for the general interest, even when viewed in the meaner and mercenary sense, that the community should acquiesce in a system, by which the capitalists of England are rapidly increasing their levies of annual income upon the productive industry of the country; and by which the hold of her government upon our popular power, by means of the number of her dependents, is progressively augmenting; and must eventually, if allowed to continue, annul the spirit, and defeat the intent of our nearly universal suffrage; — the pride and boast of freemen, and apparently the last hope of the suffering world.

The paper system, however it may have originated with, or is supported by those who, vainly and viciously, hope for the eventual ascendency of our own wealthy, in the general money excitement of the world, has already resulted in greatly strengthening and assuring the English supremacy. Our inflated circulation, and consequent high prices, has rendered America not only the principal, but the esentially important market for the sale of English natural as well as manufactured products. Without this market, and, of course, without our system of finance upon which it depends, the policy, hopes, and even the national insti-

tutions of England would fall to the ground. It is plainly confessed by the manifest zeal of her friends in our midst, that one great dread of that government is the overthrow, on this side of the Atlantic, of the paper system. This is too plain to need other demonstration, than to recall to mind the late protracted contest, between the money power and the democratic power, in relation to a United States Bank. Whatever specious and ingenious arguments were then employed by the advocates of a great national "regulator" of the currency, the primary meaning or object of their efforts was the perpetuation, if not the still greater expansion, of our fiscal policy. It is a truth too palpable for doubt, and too simple for argument; in other words, it is a political axiom, conceded by the sensitiveness of the whole monarchical and aristocratical world, that the permanence of our Federal constitution, in its restricted and *State Rights* character, will eventually, and by increasingly rapid strides, prove fatal to the false notions of right and wrong upon which all other governments are founded. It has, therefore, become imperiously necessary for the spirit of those governments, to combat, and if possible destroy the spirit of ours. The means of war or conquest have passed away with the exit of Napoleon from the field of the world; and the age of trickish diplomacy is waning as a petty and ludicrous episode, between the last and the present eras. There is, therefore, no resource left to the old species of governments, but the fashioning of our policy according to their will, by means of the creation and support of a political party in the country itself; which, by all the wiles of false professions, and the arts of deception, may possibly obtain a permanent ascendency of numbers. By whatever feasible means, however, the general democratic tendency of our institutions must, as a matter of life or death, be checked by English influence or power. Therefore it is that we ever find some immense *lever*, — more specious and threatening than, though, as the end must prove, as preposterous as that of Archimedes, for overturning

the liberties of our people, is constantly in the employ of the British emissaries. A United States Bank was, for a long time, a hopeful means of this sort in their hands; but this form of the scheme has emphatically failed. The project of a great national bank seems now to be abandoned, as an exploded concern; the renewal of the discussion of which would full probably revive that overwhelming unity of democratic action, by which the late series of attempts were dissipated as political trifles.

Nothing daunted, however, by this total defeat, but on the contrary, rendered desperate by the threatening aspect of their own domestic concerns, the government and capitalists of England have promptly adopted another, and, it is to be feared, more dangerous plan for the demolition of our free institutions: — a plan, based upon the misdirection, or leading astray, of the rife passion for liberty. England has recently thrown into the midst of our peaceful family of sovereign States, the fire-brand of discord, in the shape of the question of Slavery. That infamous government, deeply sunk in all the hideous immoralities of the money excitement; and which holds millions of her own subjects, the whole of miserable Ireland, and hordes of wretched Asiatics, in a condition for which slavery were a mild and charitable name, has, with diabolical hypocrisy, freed her black slaves, in petty districts of her domains bordering on our country; and this with the concurrence of her subtle capitalists! He who can look at the aggregate policy of that government; at her systematic opposition to liberal principles at home and abroad, and who appreciates the savage, — the murderous spirit of money-intoxicated minds, and yet, can seriously pronounce the word *humanity* in connexion with this artful move of the law mongers and fund mongers of England, must be dead to every sense of justice and right reason. Humanity may yet sometimes be an individual sentiment, but all history is false, if it has ever been an aristocratic mo-

tive. Policy, and policy alone, profound, comprehensive, and entirely consistent, is at the foundation of the scheme; and its chief bearing and intent is to weaken, if not destroy, the union of our States, and thereby to effect the suppression of Democracy. The strenuous agitation of this, in itself narrow and contemptible question, — which is like the tithing of mint, and annise, and cummin, and forgetting far weightier matters, —will, at the least, so far serve the foreign purpose, as to wean, for a while, the public mind in the United States from other, and to our enemies tormenting reforms. In this way they may hope that even the anti-bank feeling will retrograde, and another mammoth money institution slip into existence. They may even expect to far transcend all their pre-existing contrivances in this country, by feeding to high sectional exasperation this false and misdirected excitement. At all events, the project promises to be counter-revolutionary in its tendencies; and however uncertain in its results, is therefore flattering to the devotees of ancient impositions.

The doctrine of the independent sovereignty of the States, in all things not expressly conceded to the Federal government by the Constitution of the Union, is the fundamental principle of the Republic; the whole sum and meaning of the Constitution itself. The failures of all former attempts at republican government on earth, are justly attributable to their consolidated, or singly national character. We have long been taught, and sufficiently, that such is the tendency of nations to assimilate in their institutions, — a tendency much increased in modern times, by the extension of commercial relations, — that no *one* people, with a widely peculiar form of government, can long preserve their peculiarities. Again, it is equally an historical truth, that even when several such governments, somewhat similar in form and proximate in locality, are not firmly allied for mutual peace and safety, they must either successively fail, from the external moral or coercive influences, or become extinct through jealousies and

contests among themselves. And truly, when we reflect on the very natural law, in all consolidated nations, whereby "power is constantly stealing from the many to the few," until it results in monarchy or revolution, we cannot wonder at the fate of the ancient Republics, or too much admire the inherently safe structure of ours. Our Union, which is one from, or out of many—"*E Pluribus Unum*"—is fortified by all those necessary "checks and balances," which coequal sovereignties have ever, in the whole history of the world, endeavored to effect by artificial alliances, based upon that spurious and therefore constantly fallible fiction, the peculiar sanctity of international contracts. The alliance of our many republics is based on entirely different, and more natural and permanent principles. The twenty-six sovereign States are intimately, and exclusively among themselves, associated by a CONSTITUTION that, in as much as it precludes any subsequent alliance between State and State, or a State and a foreign country, is in its nature superior to old-fashioned treaties, without effecting even an approach to a common nationality. In each State, too, the frequency of elections for the public authorities, which are a sort of peaceful, well regulated, and anticipatory revolutions, effectually defeats the natural tendency to usurpation, either by individual men or by party; while family pride and emulation are safeguards of the whole. By this novel, wise, and permanent alliance, the collective sovereignties of the Union have agreed to act, in all their external relations, in common; while in their domestic affairs they are as independent of the whole as of each other. They exist in association as freemen in society, with the indisputable right to do their individual pleasure, provided they do not trespass on the like freedom of others. Under this form of Union we have long lived, and can live through the indefinite future, happy among ourselves, and secure from open aggression from abroad. On the other hand, the aristocratical doctrine of a general, or even a limited central nationality, is not only false, but manifestly impracti-

cable. The extent of our country over every natural climate; the vast geographical peculiarities of the distinctive States, and the diversity of their relations to external nations, preclude the possibility of one general government legislating for the whole. We have already experienced the inconvenience, trouble, and danger of the exercise of even doubtful powers, by the general congress, which has at times erroneously assumed a national or governmental character. We have fully learned the important fact, that a central national government, properly so called, cannot exist in our country, unless enforced by those coercive means which are in their very nature incompatible with republican institutions.

Without the general prevalence of the political heresy of CONSOLIDATION, among our own people, all the arts and designs of England must fail, and the spirit of Democracy go on over the earth "conquering and to conquer." This doctrine, heretical in America, though perfectly orthodox in Europe, is the nucleus of all opposition to our free institutions, at home or abroad. In every act, maxim, or proposition of the British party in this country, there is to be found the idolatry of consolidation, as the one principle of party existence. The idol is not now, indeed, so plainly exposed as when openly worshipped by the old Federalist sect; but is ever within a thin and flimsy veil, strangely ornamented with changeable appelatives and fustian pretensions. The Bank of the United States was a *national* bank. Beside or beneath all its other purposes, it would serve to embody or amalgamate the States; or rather, by its control of the general money interest of our citizens, it would supersede, or at least prove paramount to our constitutional relations founded on the supposed weaker interest of liberty:—it would effect aristocratical community, by being a great wheel of power, or including case, containing within it all the subordinate parts of our political machinery. In like manner the "protective Tariff" was a *national* act:

coercive in its nature, and springing from usurped, because sovereign, power. It came, too, from that class of artful politicians, who, while they affect to feel for the working classes of the country, are "high-prices" men, in the fullest sense of the term; the champions of property and capital, and the devotees of consolidation. And now, that these have failed them, and disappointed their foreign masters, in the extremity of their haste and distress, they have fairly broached among us the "NATIONAL SIN" of slavery!

The puritanical religionists of the Northern and Eastern States are now piously invoked by holy mother England, to avert the wrath of God from her beloved sister NATION, the United States, by immediately enforcing the abolition of Southern slavery! Like all interlude or specific passions of society, this fanatical zeal must burn, ungovernable, through its necessarily transient career. One may almost read the whole progress of this singular furor, in the nature of man and the structure of society. This much, however, is certainly plain, that burn it does, and burn it will to an extent that will behoove every rational citizen to be incessantly on his guard, that all he prizes in our institutions be not therewith consumed. There has already been a WORLD'S Convention of these maniacs at the foot of England's throne; and could they effect it, they would assemble all created intelligences, on some remote orb of the boundless universe, to point out, as the little earth revolved in the mighty distance, the one dark speck of its concentrated iniquity; and in the obscure intervals, demonstrate to angels and archangels, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the whole purport of the law of Sinai was — slavery at the south! It is vain, however, to treat this new wonder-birth of Abolition with contempt, or to anticipate its immediate decline and fall. It has been already too much disregarded; been kept out of political view, as supposed to be confined to a very limited number of our citizens. This may be true as to those who, as yet, have the dis-

ease in its raging stage; but whole communities are more or less infected, and the minds of their youth fashioning to receive it. Fostered as it is, by all the clans of consolidationists, and backed by the whole English system, it will but too probably grow to be the most formidable shape the indefatigable enemy of our institutions has ever yet assumed. It will severely try the patriotism of the Union.

The Northern and Eastern States do not contain all the fanatics connected with this singular excitement; — the consolidationists of the South and West being evidently as wild, in the opposite direction, as any abolitionists in the world. It is surely quite as absurd, and fully as foreign to the nature of our Union, to advocate slavery as a *national* blessing, as to oppose it as a *national* sin. Little indeed would the apparent contrarieties of these two sects import, if they could but entirely occupy each other's attention. But in fact, they theoretically unite in the *nationality* of the subject, and in the same original and unfounded assumption, that there is an important difference in the hard working of man by man, for a pittance of money, and that of working him for a pittance of food; and thus they mutually glorify money and consolidation. In like manner, they unite practically, in a common opposition to republican measures and men; — a proposition or a candidate ever *going too far* for the one, and not far enough for the other; while they are respectively inflamed by their protracted and futile controversy. It is folly to reason with either faction. An excitement, a communal passion, is in its nature beyond the reach of argument. It can be put down by no earthly means whatever; but in all cases, great or small, must, like a disease, run a natural course to the peculiar crisis. The abolitionism of our times is not a conclusion of the reason, but a simple feeling. It may, perhaps, be restrained within comparatively narrow bounds, as in a lazaretto, by the calm, firm, and united resistance of the morally healthy, until its dangerous force is exhausted; but

the power is not now on earth that can speak or drive the evil spirit out of the afflicted.

Fanatics cannot reason. It is, therefore, ever their fate to become the tools of designing and hypocritical politicians. They, who have fomented the terrific disturbance of abolition, know full well that it cannot effect its ostensible object, and care not if it could. The only value they attach to it, is in the hope that it may *nationalize* the whole, or two distinct halves of the Union. It is well understood by these adepts, that the now existing peculiarities of the States, in their climates, character of productions, and domestic institutions, are, whether good or bad in themselves, the stay and support of our State Rights Constitution. If by any means these diversities could be annulled, and all the people of all the States become nearly assimilated in habits and opinions, it is plain that distinct State governments would be worse than useless; would be expensive folly. To any hope of attaining this end, climate is evidently an insuperable impediment; and therefore, a division of the Union, between the northern and southern States, would be accepted by our enemies, as a first step to the full accomplishment of their objects. This division, in as much as it would also separate the slave-holding from the non-slave-holding republics, would leave each portion in so near an approach to the moral assimilation of their respective people, that consolidation, usurpation of governing power, and at last monarchy, would then be a comparatively feasible, and, it may be, spontaneous finale.

Such are the objects, means, and ends of the collective "English policy"; and such the character of the "British party," already formidable in this land of Liberty. He who has a particle of true patriotism in his soul, or who possesses even a feeble share of common philanthropy, must repudiate the whole with scorn and indignation. But, individual protests and abhorrence, without zeal and concert of action, are harmless and

idle things. Few existing governments on earth, could endure for a day or an hour, if a mere miscellaneous and discordant hatred by their people, could overthrow them. Even here at home, a NEW unity of patriotic feeling; a complete reorganization of the host of republicans, — having hatred of England, her government, and her system, as its prominent characteristic, — is become eminently essential to the conservation of our institutions. This cannot be materially effected by art, or shaped according to the wishes or ingenuity of any man, or class of men; but chiefly by the supreme law of consecutive social passions, that alternately governs and revolutionizes, despite all diverse national peculiarities, the social and political affairs of mankind. The great passion for wealth, which is now approaching its climax of phrenzy, has completely supplanted that of glory and conquest; and, in its turn, must yield to the new-born ardor for individual liberty which, even now, is every where obtruding upon human governments. Collective society is evidently, at this day, in that irruptive stage which has ever attended the commencement of a new moral era; and forbodes the resistless progress of a mighty spirit, that, however liked or disliked; however beneficent or malignant, preservative or destructive, must and will reign upon the earth until its natural demise; bidding proud defiance, as well to concerted opposition, as to contingent impediments.

This spirit is DEMOCRACY. And would that it had pleased the great Power of Control to have severed it widely from the concomitant vengeance, that will, in the earlier part of its career, impress its enemies as the coming of final retribution and wrath. Let it not be disguised from the myriads of minds just now vaguely attempered to the mystery of the present, and the obscurity of the future, that, like each of the great precedent passions, this will be attended by apparent evils, that long ere it passes away, will make it a sorrow to the good and wise. Not that they will or can justly regret its being, or impeach the wisdom of those

who primitively bore it onward in its course, acting in legitimate obedience to the law of Progress, and in ample view of its philosophic meaning, its sequence or fruition. If we recur to historical truth, and recognise, in remote ages, that it was right for the patriarchs to go into Egypt, and also right, after the era revolved, for their descendants to come out from thence, and then follow up the succession of revolutions to the present time, we shall discover, that in the abstract nature of the dynasty of social passions, the termination of the old is ever attended by oppression, and the beginning of the new by great hope. It may indeed, be recorded as a prominent clause in the law of Progress, that the commencement of every new moral era justly claims the support of the Liberalists of the time. It is never so much a question with these, what the actually ruling principle is in itself; whether it be perfect or imperfect; purely just, or intermixed with evil; as whether it be in strict accordance with the march of time, and that promise of eventual happiness which is in all collective being; or merely isolated and unmeaning, as many minor excitements have been. Detached, sectional, and transient irruptions of social feeling, however violently they may rage, add nothing to the furtherance of, but rather suspend the grand tendencies of creation. They may always be known by their sudden birth and inflation; by their ready accordance with ancient institutions and prejudices, and by palpable *unfitness*, through a want of correspondence with the general "signs of the times." They are of those false things, of which many have already been with the proclamation "Lo here!" for which the staid and careful mind has ever been prepared. They have nothing to do with the reality of progress; and though for a while they deceive many, soon pass away, leaving as it were mere accidental and unintelligible blots upon the page of history.

The spirit of Democracy is of a different, and far more serious type. Like all those which have hereto-

fore actually revolutionized society, and marked it with a durable change of character, this spirit advances upon the earth, with the resolved, graduated, and steady step incidental to inherent right, and inevitable success. Its claim to universal sovereignty, is every where acknowledged by the impatient and premature hostility of the worshippers of the past and present. A deep and ominous dread; "a fearful looking for" of ruinous events, is impressed upon the minions of the money power, and betrays their conscious or instinctive knowledge of the new paramount principle of the future. They know that its elements; — the ardent love of individual liberty, and the organization of society wholly upon strictly just and entirely *general* regulations, — are at total variance with those old and ingenious hypotheses upon which their favorite system is founded,— necessary evils, aggregate happiness out of common misery, and far distant future blessing for present endurance. It is, therefore, justly deemed Radical in its character; and, by this quality, to transcend all preceding revolutions. By the common consent, by the united convictions of the world, Democracy is the most profound and comprehensive spirit that has ever claimed or obtained the control of society. All former revolutions, however consequential, chiefly involved the lords and leaders of men, or aimed only at the seat of power; while that which impends, includes all collective mankind, and, in its career, will prove to be no mean exemplification not only of the shaking of the earth, but of the heavens also.

Like the rush of mighty waters overflowing, it is then conceded, that the vast oppressed majority of mankind, will sooner or later, break from the conventional restraints of subtle theories and prejudices, and pour forth successfully, upon the collective powers of Misrule. That they will not always heed unnecessary devastation, or confine themselves to judiciously devised courses of action, is incidental to the very nature of a revolution that is resisted. And resisted democracy will

be, to the last gleam of hope, by all those who are, or strongly desire to be in the ascendency of wealth. As certain as the Church resisted the infancy of the Reformation by all manner of means, and the great Hero of warlike glory violently opposed the young English system, under the more mature force of which he fell, so will the vast and fully developed Money Power, oppose, with unprecedented vigor and subtile ingenuity, the growth of the Democratic spirit. The passion for wealth and the ardent love of Liberty, are antagonist powers worthy of each other. The one eminently brave, confident, and heedless of secondary obstacles; the other cowardly, cunning, and minutely systematic; it is evident there can never be compromise between them. They are thoroughly incompatible, and at the utmost extremes of variance. In no modern convulsion of society, have the appropriate differences of individual opinion extensively broken the minor conventional relations of social life. In the contest between the Catholic and Feudal principles; the Military and Ecclesiastical; the Commercial and Military, families and even whole nations very generally took part in mass, while individual peace was seldom disturbed. The forthcoming era, however, will manifest characteristics as profound and enlarged as are its contending passions. The conflict between individual interest and individual feeling, will probe society to its elementary foundations, and make trifles even of the closest ties of consanguinity. The world has, in all time, occasionally experienced brief periods of individual persecution and antipathy, which seemed to be prophetic indications of subsequent social dissolution; and here at home, within a few years past, there have been promiscuous threatenings, in high political struggles, to sever the ordinary business relations of society, and suspend its courtesies, in paramount obedience to a vague party spirit. But when the great antagonist hosts shall come to their new, true, and severally consolidated character, these yet flickering indications will become identified with the genius of the times. All species of associa-

tion of man with fellow man, of opposite moral characters, will cease, through the ripened hatred of the one, and the pusillanimity of the other. As firm resolution easily passes into obstinacy, suffering, wretchedness, and starvation may become matters of pride — as sometimes in the monastic age — and constant discord, public and domestic, give rise to continual broils, painful, destructive, bloody.

The programme of the story is told; let the details be wisely left to time, or fancy accommodate them to the hopes or the fears of politicians. To one class of men, the worst that can be apprehended has no terrors; to the other class, the best that can be hoped for is appaling. If there yet be those who are indifferent or neutral, they will soon tremblingly fall in with the one, or manfully join the other. The worst features the revolution can possibly assume will be amply justified, and, indeed, accurately measured, by the immense mass of social evil to be overthrown; a mass that, as the spirit advances, will gradually develop its enormity, now dimmed by habit and prejudice. The final result is inevitable. Then why should we endeavor to put off that "evil day," which all ages and events have prophesied, or in any way resist the final cause of creation itself, in the successive and distinct demonstrations of general society? Evils, serious and dreadful, have attended the origin and course of every former social revolution. Nothing that can occur in the impending career of the democratic spirit, but will have had its antetype, or corresponding feature, in one or more of those which have preceded it. Even *demagoguism* — undue individual ascendency — to which the democratic era seems particularly liable, has its parallel in the money system, and had in all that have gone before it. Who is this, or that man, that he should be the wealthiest, or the bravest, or the holiest of all around him? Surely nothing but the indefatigable use of the tolerated means of the time — no matter whether honest or dishonest — has ever effected personal ascen-

dency; which, heretofore, has been quite as spurious as it will or can be in the early and imperfect part of the reign of Democracy. Instead of being of a specially exceptionable type, the coming variety of individual superiority will approximate gradually to the natural or heavenly gifts of men, until, in the end, stratagem and contingency may altogether vanish, and society come to be organized wholly upon the immutable and eternal laws of universal mind.

The prominent men of any one system of social organization have ever characteristically differed from the prominent men of the others; and each successive class has been utterly destitute of substantial claims. The feudal lords; the monks and prelates; the military generals, possessed an altogether adventitious supremacy over their contemporaries; and it is certainly quite as well that popular declaimers, or men of mere political tact, or, in extremity, even the pride of poverty, should sway, for a time, the minor evolutions of society, as that our merchants should be "the great men of the earth." On broad, philosophical principles, there is no ground for choice among the whole; but in view of the law of Progress, each successive species of ascendency is better than the former. The guide of thought and reason is rightfully in the convergence of events to the future, and not in their divergence from the past. The great inquiry of the human mind is, and ever has been, what does creation mean? or, to what result — magnificent and wonderful, beyond doubt — are all things tending? The feelings of prophetic hope and prophetic fear, that have ever divided mankind under all systems of society, irresistibly testify, not only to the instability of the time being, but to a certain grand climacteric era, in the future, which shall simplify and explain the whole mystery of the past; shall satisfactorily solve the complex problem of evil, and usher in Reality through the ruins of Fiction. If then, there were yet to come a thousand of those moral kings, or reigning passions, like unto the few

which have been already, and are passing or passed away, the children of Hope would justly All-hail the coming one. But, there will be no more. It is a general feeling in all classes of men, that Democracy will not only fell and root up all the stately products of artificial cultivation, but plough deep the surface of the whole earth, to the final annihilation of even the germs of fiction. After having quelled resistance, and thereby, having its vindictiveness satiated, it will rapidly mellow down; and finally, leave society with a surface placid and unsophisticated, in comparison with any former period, and for the first time, since the primitive fall, fitted for the extraordinary novelty of "Peace on earth, good will towards men," and the eternal reign of the King of Kings.

V.

Art. III. — *The Policy to be pursued hereafter by the Friends of the Constitution, and of Equal Rights.*

Contrary to our wishes, but hardly contrary to our fears, we have now to record the signal success of the friends and supporters of William Henry Harrison. The whigs are now in the ascendency in the Union, and in a majority of the States. With the fourth of March next, commences a whig dynasty, to last at least four years. The people have so willed, and, whatever may be our individual convictions, hopes, or fears, we must submit.

Whether this result will be for the good of the country, or the evil, it is impossible as yet to decide. We have not desired it. We have had no fellowship with the whig party, no sympathy with their methods of electioneering, and no confidence in their acknowledged principles. We have deprecated their success as a serious calamity, similar in its nature to the subjugation of a free and independent people by a foreign power, and likely to be not less disastrous in its conse-

quences. We have honestly believed that the safety of our free institutions, the progress of liberty and social Equality, demanded the reëlection of Mr. Van Buren, and the success of his friends in the Union and the States. But a majority of the people, wisely or unwisely, have decided differently, and though we cannot, as yet, honor their decision, we must respect it as the law of the land till it be reversed.

But however much we may fear of the worst, we owe it to ourselves to say, that we by no means despair of the Republic. We are not among those, who have unbounded confidence in the actual virtue and intelligence of the people; and the recent elections have by no means tended to increase what little confidence we may have had; but we have great faith in the capacities of human nature, and we believe there is already enough of virtue and intelligence in our community, to arrest any dangerous tendency in the government, before it shall be too late. Moreover, we believe firmly in an overruling Providence; and the Providence, which has selected this as the chosen land of freedom, thus far watched over and protected us, and prepared us for the work assigned us in the progress of civilization, we cannot believe will abandon us before we have accomplished our mission. We confide with calmness in the God of our fathers, and trust that he will yet deliver us from the Philistines, and enable us to build the Temple of Freedom, which shall abide the ravages of time, and within which shall one day meet in peace, to pay their vows, the whole family of disenthralled and regenerated man.

Moreover, in analyzing with some care the elections which have resulted in favor of General Harrison, we still find ground for hope. The people in these elections have not, in their own estimation, decided against freedom and equality; nay, they have not decided against the doctrines or measures of the democratic party. They have not deserted, and we have as yet no reason to believe that they will desert, their ancient democratic faith. However it may have been

with the whig leaders and wire pullers, the great mass of the people whom they have carried away, have not voted against the administration because they have condemned its measures. They have asked not for a change of measures, but of men. They have looked upon the present administration, in its administrative character, as low-minded and corrupt, as deficient in both capacity and integrity, and therefore as unfit to be entrusted with the management of public affairs. Here is the secret of the recent revolution, — a revolution which in the minds of the majority of the people extends only to men. The people we need not say have been deceived, wofully deceived; but the moment they become aware of the fact, they will lose no time in rectifying their mistake. If the men, they have now placed in power, undertake to carry out a policy essentially different from that which has been pursued for the last twelve years, they will hurl them from power at the earliest moment permitted by the forms of the Constitution.

With this conviction, we cannot despair. We believe the present administration has been most grossly belied; but, in its purely administrative character, we have no disposition to take up its defence. In this character, it has no extraordinary claims on the affection of the people. It is remarkable neither for its sagacity nor its purity. There are, we should hope, many other men in the country who can administer the government as well as they have done. Still in justice to Mr. Van Buren, we must say, that in the measures requiring legislative action, which he has recommended or sustained, he has done well, been faithful to the Constitution, and deserves, as he will one day receive, the gratitude of his country.

Mr. Van Buren has been defeated; but he is much dearer to the American people to-day than he was when elected President. He has failed in his reëlection, not because he has lost in popularity, but because he never was the choice of the American people. The people never willed his elevation to the presidential chair. He

was elevated to that chair, not by his own popularity, but by the popularity of his predecessor, and by the management of party leaders. Since he became President, he has for the first time in his life gained a place in the affections of the American people, and he retires from the presidency, with an enviable popularity, and an honest fame which will endure.

We are, however, far from regarding Mr. Van Buren as entirely free from faults, and faults which in these times cannot be without results. He strikes us as deficient in boldness and enthusiasm. He has great coolness, is firm, and will die in the last ditch sooner than abandon his avowed principles; but his better qualities rarely manifest themselves till he is put upon his defence; and, though they may spread a glory around his grave and secure him a hero's fame, they generally come too late to retrieve the losses of his friends, or to change the fortunes of the day. His policy is to wait, to trust to time, to "the sober second thought of the people"; in other words to follow public opinion and events, not to lead them. His is not the bold master mind that seizes time by the forelock, that creates his own public, and bends it to his will. He may ride upon the storm, but he does not direct its course. Yet there is something almost sublime in the calmness, the composure with which he suffers himself to be carried along, whither he apparently sees not. He is not deficient in mere intellect, and his political information is respectable. In ordinary times, when passion is asleep, and reason awake, he were not ill qualified to be the president of a free people. But in these revolutionary times, his qualities are not of the sort most in demand. He wants elevation, nobility of ideas, and warmth of heart. Sober reasoning, calm reflection, mere good sense are not now the sovereigns of the world. Men's passions are aroused, their feelings are excited, and they are moved by appeals to their sympathies rather than to their understandings. They see not clearly, but they feel intensely; and they ask for a man to go before them who fears not the darkness, whose step falters

not, and who can lend them a confidence not their own. Such a man Mr. Van Buren has not proved himself. One such man we had in Thomas Jefferson; another we had in Andrew Jackson; another — we shall find him in due time.

That the administration party has been defeated through its own faults, rather than through the frauds, falsehoods, and misrepresentations of the opposing party, of which there have been enough, and more than enough, for even Beelzebub's infinite satisfaction, we suppose it would not be difficult to show. But, what were the use in attempting to do it? It is a miserable disposition, that which delights to dwell on the blunders of friends, or which can bring itself to upbraid associates with the reverses which all must share in common. Defeat like the grave levels all distinctions, and hides all faults. If things had been different, they would have been different. This is the amount of all fault-finding with the past. But things were as they were, and the result is what it is, and there is the end of the matter, and no more need be said about it. It is not the temper of Democracy to weep over past errors, or to turn round and scold her friends when she chances to meet a repulse. Her face is ever towards the future, which alone is hers; and she labors to recruit her forces, and to stand ready for whatever may come. She knows that though she may be checked in her onward march for a moment, she cannot be driven back; and that though she may sometimes fail to win, she never loses. If her leaders managed badly yesterday and failed, she trusts that they will acquire wisdom from their mismanagement, and become able to conquer tomorrow.

We regret, deeply regret, the ill success of the democratic party; but we have no reproaches to cast on friend or foe. We are as ready to engage again with those with whom we fought side by side yesterday, as we should have been, had we entirely approved, as we did not, their arrangements. In this we are not alone. We express the feelings of the great body of those, who,

as friends of the Constitution and of Equal Rights, have struggled, with what skill and bravery were in them, to sustain the administration. We have been unsuccessful, but we have not lost our temper, nor are we disposed to run foul of one another. We have by a common fate become but the more endeared to each other. Personal animosities have subsided. The Democracy will hereafter be disturbed by no intestine divisions, by no personal rivalries; but will present to the enemies of liberty and social progress, an unbroken front, a closely knit body, animated by one and the same soul, and directed by one and the same will They are now indeed a band of brothers, sworn to stand by one another; and they will stand by one another in adversity, as they did not always in prosperity; and so long as one of them can stand, liberty shall not want a defender, nor social equality an advocate.

For the present the Democracy will wait the movements of the new dynasty. They will assume not the attitude of opposition, but of watchfulness. If the whig policy shall prove to be democratic, they will not oppose it, but give it their cordial support. But if it be at war with that which has been pursued by the administration for the last twelve years, as there is but too much ground to fear that it will, then it must count on an opposition, not factious, but calm, determined, uncompromising, whether successful or unsuccessful. The whig party has come into power by pretending to be democratic; it has come in, to a considerable extent, unpledged, and is therefore free to adopt the democratic policy if it chooses; we must then wait its movements, and hold ourselves free to sustain or oppose as it shall prove itself democratic or not.

During this period of waiting, we must not, however, be idle. We must avail ourselves of the comparative repose, with which we are favored, to fix the basis of our creed, to consolidate our policy, and to prepare ourselves to take the field again, if we must take it again, with a perfect understanding of the objects for which

we are to contend, and with as entire agreement as may be, concerning the methods by which we must proceed, and by which we may hope to win.

Two parties there are in this country, and two parties there always will be ; — a party in favor of Property, whose leading object will be to facilitate the profitable investment of business capital, to make the government a mere instrument for facilitating trade ; and a party in favor of Man, whose leading object will be to secure to the workingman a greater share of the proceeds of his labor, and to elevate labor and make it honorable. These two parties have existed from the formation of the Federal Government, and they will not cease to exist under the new dynasty. Whether the whigs in their actual policy will ultimately prove themselves the first named party or the second, we shall not now attempt to determine. For our part, we shall always be found with the second, the party of the Constitution, of Equal Rights, of the workingman, whatever may be the name by which it may be called, and whether it be in power or out of power.

This second named party is properly the party of the Constitution, and of Equal Rights. It in reality comprises a large majority of the American population, and when it can be rallied, as it has not been effectually in the late contest, it is able to carry everything before it. The great aim of the friends of liberty, of social progress, and the practical realization of the principles incorporated into our free institutions, should be to rally this party, to unite in one body all who sympathize with it. This party has heretofore failed, because vast numbers of those, who properly belong to it, have not come to its aid. False issues have been made, and elections have not turned on the real matters in dispute. Hence this party, the true democratic party of the country, has been divided, and friend has, unhappily, fought against friend, and natural and irreconcilable enemies have fought in the same ranks side by side. This has created no little confusion, and caused all the disasters the Democracy has experienced. We must study to

remedy this evil, to make up the *true* issue, and collect all the democrats of the country under the same banner, and keep them on one and the same side.

This can be done only by falling back on first principles. The Democracy is never moved by mere words, by mere shadows. It is grave, solemn, earnest. It demands realities. It asks for the substance. It supports no party because it bears this or that name, no individuals because they are *called* democrats. A party to gain its suffrages must *be* democratic; and men must *be* democrats, or it will not confide in them, or follow their guidance. It asks only what is just, and that it does ask. It asks for an open, straight-forward, honest policy. It has a great dislike to all manœuvering, to all crooked paths, to all underhanded methods of proceeding. It would take its ground openly and manfully, in the broad light of day, and maintain it by fair means, or not at all. It has also a great horror of half-way measures, measures, which excite all the opposition of whole measures, and yet effect nothing when carried. The timid, trimming, compromising policy, so much insisted upon by fourth-rate politicians, finds no support in the instincts or the reason of the people. Democracy abhors it, and it can find supporters only among mere party leaders themselves. Democracy demands a bold policy; measures which amount to something; which reach far and wide; and which will accomplish something worth making an effort for. Who will go to war, risk ease, wealth, life itself, when even victory secures no advantage? The leaders of the democratic party have erred on this point. They have talked finely, but they have done little else than talk. They have eulogized Liberty, declaimed about Equality, and spoken of the dignity of labor, but unhappily, they have kept too far in the abstract. They have proposed little that is tangible, palpable; and the people have felt that, if all which they propose were adopted, it would effect but a slight, a scarcely perceptible mitigation of the evils of our existing social state.

Some may say that our friends have failed to succeed even in the small measures they have proposed, and ask, how then could they have succeeded in greater measures? It is simply because their measures have been small, and capable of realizing only a trifling good, that they have failed. They have failed not because they have attempted too much, but because they have attempted too little. They have proposed nothing big enough to fill the heart of the people, to enlist its affections, kindle its enthusiasm, and call forth its energy. The giant will not rouse himself to crush a fly. If you really mean to be true to the great principles of freedom and equality, if you really mean to ameliorate society, elevate the laborer, and make every man really a man, free and independent; then you must say so, and show by the measures you propose that you mean so. Show that you are in earnest, that you are contending for something, and that you have the nerve to contend for it effectually, and then you will inspire confidence, touch the nobility of human nature, the magnanimity of the people, and carry the masses in one solid phalanx with you. You must have the souls of heroes, if you wish to take the place of heroes, or reap their success. Nay, if you ask for heroic deeds from the people, you must give them a cause able to kindle the heroic spirit. If you have no inborn heroism, if you have no power to grasp the great, the noble; no courage to propose the bold and the daring; then stand aside, with your timid, half-way measures, bowing, and cringing, and praying to be admitted; stand aside and let men, who have the souls of men, the minds and the hearts of men, who fear nothing, who tremble, blench at nothing, save the mean, the wrong, the inefficient, let them take your places, and try their hand at conducting the Democracy to victory.

The truth is, too many, who call themselves democrats, are democrats only in the abstract, only in pretty phrases, or high-sounding words, and flattering epithets. Propose any thing really democratic, anything that is likely to result in making democracy something

more than a splendid dream, and forthwith these sonorous democrats are frightened, they look pale, and begin to tremble for their own cushioned seats. Poor fellows! They are afraid they shall be *disgigged*, and thus lose their respectability. Such are not the men to lead on the Democracy. Whoso loves father or mother, sister or brother, wife or children, nay, or his own life, more than Democracy, is not worthy in these times to be her champion. Her cause can be promoted only by men who dare to live for her, or if need be to die for her; who can joy even in exile, in the dungeon, or on the cross, at the prospect of her success.

Men love the brave spirit, the heroic soul, and they fall down and worship him who risks all that is dear to him in their cause. Why are men so attracted by military glory? why has military prowess such power over the masses? Because, men delight in war and bloodshed, in hewing and mangling the bodies of their brethren, in carrying widowhood to the wife, and childlessness to the mother? Nonsense. Men are not cruel. They delight not in scenes of carnage; they hear no music in the groans of the wounded and dying, the bereaved and the disconsolate. It is because they see courage, nobility, disinterestedness, a power in the warrior that raises him above himself, above all fear of danger, or death. It is because war reveals the brave, the heroic spirit. Here too is the reason why the people always prefer the military chieftain to the mere politician. They distrust the politician, because they believe him cool, calculating, crafty, selfish, cowardly, destitute of bravery and enthusiasm, as most politicians have been and are. The people care little for mere intellect. They have no faith in dry calculations, in the cool deductions of logic. Intellect to them is a god, only when it is accompanied by high moral qualities, nobleness of soul, generous emotion, warmth of affection, and a contempt of difficulties and dangers.

But, interposes one of our *prudent* politicians, You are all wrong. You ruin everything by going too fast. You must not outrun public sentiment. Away

with your public sentiment! Seize the right, the true, the beautiful, the good, hold them up in their native simplicity and loveliness, and know that public sentiment is sure to be with you. The "common people" will listen to you with open ears, eyes, and mouth. They will arm in your defence, declare you their king, and take the kingdom for you by storm. It is your want of confidence in the greatness and generosity of human nature, that ruins you; it is your fear that, if you trust the people with the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, they, like a herd of swine, will turn and rend you, that makes you powerless, mean and insignificant. Out upon you! If you are democrats, dare trust the people, dare trust them with the truth, dare trust them with all that you believe necessary to their salvation. Ask not what they believe, what they will support. Be generous, be brave, be heroic, speak the truth and support the right, at the sacrifice of your lives if need be, and know that they then believe what you believe, and support what you support.

But, is there no danger of being rash, of attempting more than the people will bear? Miserable cowards, who boast that "discretion is the better part of valor,"

> "That he who fights and runs away,
> May live to fight another day;"

we advise *you* to attempt nothing at all. If you have not confidence enough in the people to trust them with much, be assured that they will not trust you with little. True prudence is what you would call rashness. True prudence is never made up of timidity and selfishness, but of lofty daring, and generous confidence.

This feeling that politicians have about the imprudence of attempting much, and the prudence of attempting little, arises from a mistaken notion of the true office of government. In nearly all ages and countries of the world, the office of government has been to impose burdens on the people, to force from the people a larger portion of their earnings, or to keep

them quiet under an order of things from which the few alone profit. Hence the necessity of craft, of subtlety, secrecy, dissimulation on the part of the politician. It becomes necessary for him to proceed with great caution, to seem to be what he is not, to pretend one thing and to do another. Now if this be the office of government, the politicians are right. If it be their object, by the aid of government to ride the people, it is prudent for them to beware and not attempt too much at once. If the object be to impose burdens on the people, then your half-way measures, we admit, are the safest, and the only safe measures. You must not lay on too heavy a load at once, lest the animal rear up and hit you a kick, or lest you break the poor fellow's back. But the real office of government is not to increase, but to lighten the load borne by the people. Your object should be to throw off the poor creature's burden, and to let him go free, and graze at will on the mountain or in the valley. If this *be* your object, as it should be, you must show the people that what you propose to throw off will really lighten their load, if you wish them to coöperate with you, or even to stand still while you proceed in your efforts. The people do not like to be mocked. They will not thank you for removing an ounce from their burdens, while you leave them bowed down under the weight of tons. In politics, as in all things else, the old maxim holds good, "nothing venture, nothing have."

In order then to rally the Democracy, and unite them all in a firm resolution to recover their rights, and to take the direction of the social and political affairs of the country, we must adopt a bold policy, and propose bold measures. We must show that the measures we propose will do something more than merely assuage the pain of the social wound, without healing it. Palliatives will no longer answer our purpose. Mere expedients will be worse than useless. We must go to the bottom, and lay our foundation deep. We must build on ultimate, universal, and immutable Right, and propose measures which will either destroy the social

fabric entirely, or reconstruct it as it should be. We must be thorough; propose not what we think we can carry, but what we think we ought to carry; not what we in our wisdom may deem practicable, but what in the exercise of our better nature we deem just and desirable. We must not say, "such and such a thing is right, is desirable, but the people will not assent to it." Party leaders may not assent to it, but the people will. Why should what appears to your better nature as right and desirable, not appear the same to them? Have you a different nature from theirs? Propose then, a bold and efficient policy; one which, if carried out, will realize the ideal which the wise and good are struggling after.

It is not our province, nor is it any man's province, to say authoritatively what this policy must be; but it is our right and our duty, as it is the right and the duty of every man, to give our views of what it ought to be, and to use all the moral means in our power to determine what it shall be. We propose therefore in what follows to give to some extent our views in relation to the course which should be pursued, and the measures which should be adopted, by the Friends of the Constitution, and of Equal Rights. We shall speak of course for ourselves, but we shall also speak what we have good reasons to believe will be acceptable to the great body of the Democracy. Our motive for speaking at this time is to contribute what we can to bring about a perfect agreement among all the believers in social progress, and to give to the social and political movement of our countrymen a salutary direction.

The first thing necessary to be determined is the end we are to seek. What is the end, which in our political movements we should have in view? Should we aim merely to keep things as they are? Should we be satisfied to go on as we have done for the last fifty years? Is it enough merely to maintain the forms of a free government, and to keep its administration in the hands of the democratic party? Ought we not rather to aim at some advance? Should we not regard

our free government in the light of a means to an end? Should we not feel that it is our duty to use our democratic forms of government as instruments in our hands for working out a moral and a social good? Governments, unless we have greatly erred, are worth nothing in themselves, are never to be supported for their own sake, as ends. They are valuable, they command our support, only as means, only for the use we can make of them. Can we make no better use of government than we have heretofore done? Can we not direct it to a higher end? Indeed is there not an end which we should always seek, towards which we should direct all governmental measures and action? What is this end?

We have answered this question more than once. We contend that the Mission of this country is to emancipate the proletary, to ennoble labor, raise up the laboring classes, and make every man really free and independent. Under the material relation, we ask that every man become an independent proprietor, possessing enough of the goods of this world, to be able by his own moderate industry to provide for the wants of his body; and under the spiritual relation, that he be free to develop harmoniously all his faculties, and have access to the highest culture the community can furnish. We demand for every man wealth to start with in life sufficient, if he make a proper use of it, for him to hold, so far as wealth gives distinction, an equal rank with any other man in the community. In a word we demand a state of society in which every man's rank shall be measured by his capacities, intelligence, and virtues, and where the intelligence and virtues shall be as nearly equal as the diversities of men's natural aptitudes will admit. There must not be a learned class and an unlearned, a cultivated class and an uncultivated, a refined class and a vulgar, a wealthy class and a poor. There shall not be one class owning all the funds, and another performing all the labor of production. There shall be no division of society into workingmen and idlers, employers and operatives.

There shall be workingmen, but no proletaries; for we would have all men work each on his own capital, associated or not associated, on equal terms with his brother. This is the end we aim at; this is the Mission of this country, and to this should all the measures of government directly or indirectly tend.

Now we are far from supposing that this end can or will be realized in a day. We see as clearly as any of our friends, that its realization is far distant in the future. Not indeed because the great mass of the people are not prepared for it; but because the leaders of parties are in no haste to reach it, and for the most part want courage to attempt it. But let this be as it may; the end we have designated we should keep ever in view, and the wisdom or unwisdom of every political or legislative measure should be tested by its tendency to carry us towards it, or to remove us from it. Government is of no value to us, except so far as we can use it for the realization of this end.

We say here, in order to prevent misconception, that we are far from regarding government as the only means in our power for realizing the end we have proposed. Our faith in government is not unbounded. Government has no wisdom beyond the wisdom of society, and it can in this country be nothing more than the agent of society for embodying, for executing its will. It is not government that gives the law to society; but society that gives the law to government. Unquestionably our chief concern is with society, and our main endeavor should be to create a true public opinion, and that exaltation of the public sentiment which will carry society with resistless force towards the completion of its destiny. This is to be done by moral, religious, and intellectual influences. These influences are then of course more essential than governmental action. These determine the action of society, and the end towards which it shall act.

But still we are far from regarding government, as some one asserts, as "at best a necessary evil." We look upon man as both an individual and as a member

of society; and his perfection requires both individual action and social. There are some things which he can do and must do alone by himself; there are others equally necessary to be done, which can be done and must be done by society only. Man must act collectively as well as individually. Now his collective action is the action of society, that is government. If, then, we mean society shall do anything, if we recognise in any shape the necessity of associated action, we must have government. We accept it then not only as necessary but as a great good. We would indeed leave a large space to the individual, but we would not leave him entirely alone. The *laissez-faire* doctrine, so much in vogue with a certain class of politicians, does not meet our approbation. Men require to be governed, and coercion of some sort is indispensable. They need to be combined into a whole, and directed towards a common end, which shall be for the common good of all, and the special good of each. Hence it is that we recognise, not absolute power, but a certain power in society to control the action of her members, and to force them into a qualified submission to her will. This power is founded in right, and constitutes the legitimate basis of government. We owe to society a certain obedience, and should be loyal to her whenever she steps not beyond her province.

We hold that society has the right to adopt such measures as are likely to be for the common good of all her members, and the special good of each, even against the will of individuals; nay, more, she is bound to adopt such measures at the earliest practicable moment, let the active opposition to her proceedings be what it may. If this were not so, no social progress could be made; the best and most salutary reforms could be defeated by the obstinacy, the pride, the ignorance, the prejudice, or the interested views of some half-a-dozen individuals. The whole race might be compelled to linger on in intolerable wretchedness, because a few anti-social spirits should fancy their interest was promoted by it. This will not do. Throw in-

deed a bulwark of sanctity around the individual, determine what are the rights of the individual, suffer society never to encroach upon them; but while you take care not to sacrifice one to all, take care also not to sacrifice all to one. The rights of the individual are sacred, and so are the rights of society.

Government we regard as the agent of society, the instrument by means of which society works. Our duty as individuals is to use our best influences to induce society to use this instrument wisely, effectively, and for the accomplishment of the right end. The mission of government, taken as the executive agency of society, is not merely negative. It is more than to prevent one man or one nation from encroaching on the rights of another. Its duty is positive still more than it is negative. Its business is to protect, to guide, to control, and by combining the many into one body to effect a good, which must forever transcend the reach of mere individual effort.

It is often said that men are born equal, that all men are equal by nature. This, if it have reference to their rights, or if it mean that so far forth as they are men, partakers of a common nature, they are equal, we admit it; but in almost every other possible sense we deny it. Men, regarded as individuals, are by nature unequal. Some are healthy and others are sickly, some are strong and others are weak, some are cunning and others are simple, some have bold, comprehensive minds, others timid, feeble intellects, hardly capable of putting two ideas together. Now leave all these individuals free to act according to their natural capacities, and what must be the result? A state of gross inequality. All the advantages of society will be monopolized by the strong and the cunning, who will not fail to throw all its burdens upon the weak and less gifted. But even admitting that government should prevent all encroachment upon the rights of these last, we should not be satisfied. The strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak. Government should step in and maintain between all the members of society that Equality, so

far as it may be done, which does not exist among men by nature. Government is mainly necessary in consequence of men's natural inequality, the perpetual tendency of which is to lead to gross social inequality, and its mission is to introduce and maintain an equality which does not exist by nature. Its mission is two-fold. On the one hand, its duty is to *protect* the rights of individuals, and on the other, to *force* individuals to perform their duties towards one another. Government is unquestionably restricted to a limited sphere of action; but within that sphere we hold that it is imperative, and may, nay is bound to enforce its commands.

We have dwelt the longer on this point, because just at present the legitimacy of all governments is questioned by a respectable class of Reformers, who condemn all political action, and look upon him who hopes to accomplish any good by the agency of government, as either a very weak or a very base-minded man; and because too many of our leading democrats are in the habit of counting on only the negative agency of government. Give us, say these last, an open field and fair play, and individual skill and enterprise will do the rest. We think not. Society as well as the individual in the progress of civilization has a great work to perform, a positive as well as a negative work; and we shall find that society must often needs perform her work, as the indispensable condition of the individual's performing his.

Assuming then that society through government has a work to perform, a mission to fulfil, an end to seek, and that this end is what we have stated it to be; we must bear in mind that this work, in this country, is to be performed by the State Governments, and not by the Federal Government. The Federal Government is neither a democratic nor an anti-democratic government, and was instituted for the purpose of carrying out neither the democratic nor the aristocratic principle. The constituents of that government are communities, not individuals, and it has no concern with the relations of individuals with one another. Its business

is solely with free and independent, but associated communities, and its duties remain precisely the same, whether these communities be internally constituted according to the democratic principle, or the aristocratic. There are certain matters which concern all the States alike, such as their relations with foreigners, with the Indian tribes, and with one another, the general welfare and common defence of the whole. These matters and these only come within the province of the Federal Government.

The first business of the American statesman is always to distinguish accurately between what he may attempt by the Federal Government, and what must be looked for from the State Governments alone. Much mischief has already arisen from not having distinguished with sufficient care between the respective provinces of the two governments. Democracy and aristocracy have both attempted to carry out their respective principles by means of the Federal Government; and hence it is we talk of democracy and aristocracy in relation to that government, when these terms, properly speaking, have no connexion with it, and can apply only to the State Governments.

It is unquestionably for the interests of democracy that the Federal Government should be kept within its province; so far democracy may apply to a party in connexion with it. It is also for the interest of the anti-democratic States, in which slavery is tolerated, to keep faithful to the Constitution, for slavery rests on State Legislation, and might be endangered if State Rights were abandoned. These States have the same interest in regard to the Federal government, that the Democracy have, and will in general be found acting with them. They constitute the same party in relation to the General Government; but not in relation to that government by any means a democratic party. It is a party made up of democrats and anti-democrats. It is properly a constitutional party, a State Rights party, and so should it be called.

As a party of the Union, we democrats of the North

must support the Federal Constitution. We must raise the State Rights Flag, or we shall not be able to maintain an open field, for the carrying out of our democratic principles, which are to be carried out solely by the agency of the State governments. In regard to the Union, then, our policy is simple. It is to maintain the Constitution, and resist all efforts of the Federal government to enlarge, directly or indirectly, its powers at the expense of the States. As a party of the Union we must not call ourselves democrats or aristocrats, but strict constructionists, constitutionalists. In acting under this relation we may have often to act with those who do not sympathize with our democratic hopes and tendencies. No matter. Are they Constitutionalists? Are they opposed to enlarging the powers of the Federal government? Do they go for the Independency of the States? Then we and they are, as a party of the Union, of the same party, although in the States themselves we may be of opposite parties. It is not necessary that a man should be a democrat, or have any democratic sympathies, in order to be a constitutionalist.

The truth is, it is not the Aristocracy of the country that has given to the Federal government its dangerous direction, but the Democracy, through the mistaken notion, that it was by that government it was to realize its hopes. The South which, though liberal and chivalrous, is by no means democratic, has been the main supporter of the Constitution. The Old Federal party of New England, during the administration of Jefferson and that of Madison, labored indefatigably to check the Federal government, and to restrict it to as narrow a sphere as possible. Massachusetts during the War carried her State Rights Doctrines to the utmost verge of treason to the Union, and the Hartford Convention solemnly proclaimed very nearly the doctrine subsequently contended for by South Carolina. If we are not much mistaken, the policy, which has so enlarged the sphere of the Federal government, was forced upon it by the leading democratic States. The

worst feature of this policy is the Tariff. But the tariff has been uniformly opposed by the Southern States, and a majority of the delegation in Congress from the New-England States. No tariff has ever received a majority of the votes of New-England, and none, not even the new tariff act, commonly called the compromise act, of 1832, has ever received a majority of the votes of the Southern delegation. The tariff policy has been from the first sustained by the Middle and Western States, which have always gone for it by large majorities. The Middle and Western States we may certainly call the democratic States of the Union. The Southern States are not democratic, for they tolerate slavery, and New-England we believe has been the principal defender of the anti-democratic doctrines of the old Federal party.

The Federalists, no doubt, wished for a consolidated republic, some few of them perhaps for a consolidated monarchy. But the South, in consequence of her peculiar domestic institutions, contended for State Rights; for she saw at once, that if all the States should be subjected to the supremacy of a central government, that her peculiar institutions would be obliged to give way before the strong anti-slavery feeling of the Middle and Eastern States. The small States too, which by no means wished to be swallowed up in the large ones, being equally represented with the large States in the Convention, were able to resist effectually the centralizationists, and to preserve to the States their sovereignty. The Federalists were defeated. They attempted under Washington, and especially under the elder Adams, to obtain by construction and administrative measures what had been denied them in the Convention. But after the election of Mr. Jefferson, and especially his reëlection, the policy of the New-England Federalists, to say the least, was almost wholly changed. They turned themselves to the State governments, and sought to lessen the importance of the Federal government. This was the policy of Otis and his associates. From the reëlection of Mr. Jefferson to

the election of John Quincy Adams, we may say to the election of Andrew Jackson, the consolidation party were not the Federalists, but the Republicans. The Middle and Western States had the preponderating influence, and the policy of New-York and Pennsylvania has been almost from the first that of the General government.

From this we infer that it by no means follows that because a man is a democrat he is not a consolidationist, or that because he is an aristocrat, he cannot be a constitutionalist. The larger States will always have a leaning towards consolidation; and when we look at the great States of the West, and see the rapidity with which they become filled with an active and energetic population, the prospects of the constutionalists do not appear the brightest. The natural tendency of all these States will be to consolidation, because being the most powerful, they fancy that they will be able to wield the Federal government in their own favor.

One thing is now certain, that the increase of the powers of the Federal Government is unfavorable to the growth of Democracy. The action of that government, the moment it steps beyond its constitutional limits, is to favor business at the expense of labor, and to benefit the capitalist instead of the operative. Hence, it follows that every democrat *ought* to be a constitutionalist. The elements, which go naturally to form the Constitutional Party, are then first the small States, which in a Consolidated Government would become insignificant; second the Slave-holding States, which have no security for their peculiar institutions but in upholding State sovereignty; and third the Democracy, the real friends of Equal Rights.

Hitherto the Democracy of the Middle and Western States have not been constitutionalists, from the mistaken notion, that it was through the Federal Government, and not the State Governments, that they were to carry out their principles. They must now look and see that the more they strengthen that Government, as it can act on them only through its measures touching

Trade, and the Currency, through its general Financial operations, the more power will they throw into the hands of the capitalists and business men of the country, and consequently the greater the burdens they will impose upon the laborer. If our friends in those States will hold up this view, if they will present this consideration as they may, there is some hope that even in them they will be able to rally the Democracy around the standard of the Constitution.

The smaller States must also be made to see that it is for their interest to resist the tendency to consolidation, that their political existence depends on their supporting the Constitution. This is by no means difficult to show, and consequently it will not be difficult to rally them under the Flag of State Rights. The Slave-holding States have, from the nature of their State institutions, a strong interest in adhering to the Constitution. If they do, we are safe, touching the Union.

We call then for a Constitutional Party, which shall be composed of the smaller States, the Slave-holding States, and of the real Democracy of the country, and by Democracy we now mean the real friends of Equal Rights and Social Progress. If these all unite, as they may, on the broad platform of the Constitution, they will constitute a majority in the Union, and will be able to resist effectually the tendency to consolidation. But without the strictest union, touching all questions coming under the cognizance of the General Government, of these three elements, the consolidationists will carry the day, and the consequences will be most disastrous to the whole country, and fatal to the cause of Liberty.

As a Party of the Union, we call upon the three elements we have enumerated to unite on the ground of the Constitution, and under the Flag of State Rights. To the South we say, in the name of the Northern Democracy, unite with us, to prevent the Northern Capitalists, and Business-men of the Middle and Western States from encroaching on the Constitution, and

we will resist all efforts of the Abolitionists to reach the question of Slavery through the action of the Federal Government. Slavery we cannot advocate, for we can see no affinity between Slavery and Democracy. We shall undoubtedly speak out unquestioned, and unobstructed, in favor of universal freedom to universal man. But if you will be faithful to the Constitution, we also will be faithful to it, and adopt no methods, countenance no methods, of interfering with Slavery in your dominions, which we might not legally adopt in regard to it in the dominions of England or France. On this ground, and on these conditions, we meet you. But if you desert us, if you side with the business population of the other sections of the country, and aid them in establishing a National Bank, in laying a Protective Tariff, and assuming directly or indirectly the State Debts, all of which measures are unauthorized by the Constitution, you may rest assured that the Democracy in one solid phalanx will go against your institutions. If no Constitutional barriers will hold you back, none will hold them back. They feel sore towards you now. They have defended you firmly, sacrificed much for the Constitution in which you had as much at stake as they; but they feel that you have been neither true to them nor to yourselves. This is a dangerous feeling for them to indulge, and unless you go *en masse* for the Constitution, you must not be surprised if they go *en masse* against Slavery. We, for ourselves, shall recommend no such method of retaliation; nay, we shall do all in our power to prevent it. But we know enough of human nature, to know that no power on earth could succeed in preventing it. You must not think that we defend Slavery on principle, that we love the institution. There is not a democrat north of Mason and Dixon's Line, that does not loathe it, and believe it a crime against Humanity. We refrain from meddling with it, simply because it is a matter which concerns States of which we are not citizens, because we can reach it by no Constitutional action, and because we believe Liberty is more interested at present in preserving

the Constitution, in maintaining State Rights, than in attempting the doubtful good of emancipating the slave, without making any provision for him after his fetters have been knocked off. But when the Constitution is once broken down, when it has become a dead letter, and the Federal Government has become through the triumph of the Money Power a Consolidated Government, the paramount and only efficient government of the country, what then is to hold us back? What then will avail the exhortations, the expostulations of men who have all their lives long been preaching up Equal Rights?

The consolidationists will aim at three measures. They will seek to establish a National Bank, to impose a Protective Tariff, and to assume the State Debts, by distributing the proceeds of the Public Lands, as they will term it, but the Surplus Revenue, as we term it, among the States. In other words they will raise by high taxes a surplus revenue, which surplus they will distribute among the States to enable the States to pay their debts, or at least sustain their credit. Here is their policy.

Now this Policy the friends of the Constitution must resist. Whether the whig party will attempt these measures, as a party or not, we pretend not to determine. But that they will be attempted by a large and powerful party, we hold to be beyond a doubt. These measures are all unconstitutional. They must then be resisted, firmly, successfully resisted, or the Union is destroyed. Look to it then, the South, look to it then, small States of the Union, look to it, Democrats, that ye be not any of you seduced into their support.

We have stated what must be the principal elements of the Constitutionalists. We now say that in the present crisis their main efforts must be directed to defeating these three measures. This is our principal work. We must maintain the Independent Treasury, we must support Free Trade, afford no countenance to a National Bank, suffer the Federal Government to

form no connexion directly or indirectly with the Paper Money System, keep down the Revenues to the wants of the Government, and leave the States to redeem their own Bonds.

This, for the present, must be the Policy of the friends of the Constitution. And to this must be added, as soon as may be, two other measures of a less negative character; one a disposition of the Public Lands, according to some plan similar to the one recommended by Mr. Calhoun; the other a change in the mode of Taxation, from the present system of Indirect Taxation, to that of Direct Taxation. These two measures are loudly called for, and will be found absolutely necessary, if we mean to maintain a federative government, and public morality. They are measures of some import, and they will be found to reach far. We shall avail ourselves of an early opportunity to discuss them at length; at present we can only indicate them, and give it as our opinion, that they must make up an integral part of the policy of that party which shall rally around the Flag of the Union, and seek to preserve the Constitution in its purity and force.

Will the Constitutionalists by adopting the policy here indicated, be able to succeed? Will they command a majority throughout the Union? We know not, ask not. By adopting this policy and contending for it in an open, manly manner, with earnestness and solemn intent, they will deserve success; they will be on the side of justice, in the right; and it is better to be defeated with the right than to triumph with the wrong. We should rarely trouble ourselves with the question of success; if we can only be sure that we have found out the Right, and done our best to sustain it, we may leave results with a calm confidence to Him to whom they belong.

We, however, readily admit that success will not be obtained without an effort. Apparently the consolidationists, the representatives of the Money Power, have now possession of the Government; and we do not fan-

cy that they will be dislodged without a long and severe struggle. As yet, history, so far as we are acquainted, presents no instance of a political contest, in which man has remained the victor over property. Sometimes commercial capital has triumphed over landed capital, plebeian wealth over patrician wealth; but simple naked Humanity over wealth itself, never. If we succeed now it will be the first time in the history of civilization. Nevertheless, we are not without hope. We believe that the interests of our country are so diverse, that man in this contest will not be utterly naked; but that the influence of a considerable portion of the capital of the country may be, after all, on his side. That we must struggle hard, is no objection. In these dull times, it is well to have something to struggle for; otherwise we should remain children always, and never know the virtue there is in manhood. A cause is not desperate because it cannot be won without difficulty, without effort, without sacrifice. Human nature loves the effort, pants for the struggle, as the hart for the water brooks, and joys in the sacrifice. It asks always for an occasion to display its power to do, to dare, to suffer, to prove that its old heroic energy is not exhausted. We have great faith in the heroism of human nature, little in its selfishness. The victory which demands sacrifice is easier won, than that to which interest alone prompts. Take your stand openly and truly on the side of God, Truth, Justice, Man, and you carry all hearts with you; and the greater the opposition you have to encounter, the more enthusiasm shall you enlist in your favor. Heaven is stronger than Hell, and God is a better Captain than the Devil.

Thus far we have spoken of the Policy to be pursued by the friends of the Federal Constitution, the Policy necessary to preserve the Federative Character of the Union, the Independency of the States, and an open field for the friends of Equal Rights to adopt within their respective States such measures as they

shall judge most likely to emancipate the Proletary, ennoble Labor, and realize Equality in our social relations as well as in our political relations. We turn now to the States, to the Policy which should be adopted by the true friends of democracy.

The democratic party, in its character of a *democratic* party, can properly in this country be only a State party, a party restricted in its operations to a single State. Doubtless the action of the Democracy of one State will have no little influence on that of another, and in general the policy which the Democracy may adopt in one State is that which ought to be adopted in all the States; but we in Massachusetts, for instance, can have no direct action on the policy pursued by other States, any more than on the policy pursued by Foreign Nations. Under the relation we are now considering them, they are Foreign Nations to one another, Free, Sovereign, Independent States, in no sense responsible one to another. We may demand of all the States that they adhere to the Constitution, and adopt through the Federal Government the policy we have decided to be Constitutional; for in this sense they are a single body politic; but we can demand only of the citizens of our own State a democratic policy. In the bosom of our own State, we may urge the most radical democracy, and as democrats we are guilty, if we do not; but we cannot urge it any where else. As democrats then we have nothing to do with the internal policy of other States, nor are we accountable for the State policy pursued in other States by those with whom we act on questions of general policy. We know them only as a Federal Party, not as a State Party.

We are particular in marking this distinction between a Federal party and a State party, between Constitutionalists and Democrats, because it is generally overlooked, and because the consequences of overlooking it are none of the best. At present the States are regarded by the great body of the people as mere departments, or prefectures, of one grand consolidated republic. Few comparatively look upon the Federal Govern-

ment and the State governments as coördinate governments. The Federal government is supreme. Federal politics absorb everything ; and so little is the true nature of the Union understood, that we presume not a few of our readers will fancy that, when we speak of Federal politics, we are talking of the views and dogmas of the old Federal Party, represented by its great leader Alexander Hamilton. Rarely will it occur to them that with us a man may be, nay should be, both a Federalist and a Democrat, — a Federalist touching the Union, a Democrat touching the States. But let this pass. The State counts for nothing in our political contests. In the bosom of the States themselves, of the towns and parishes even, Federal politics decide everything. A man's fitness to be a parish priest, a selectman, a pathmaster, is determined among us mainly by his views of Federal politics. Rarely does the election of a State, County, or Town Officer, in the Northern and Middle States, turn on local politics. Politicians calculate the votes of a State for President by its votes for town officers, supervisors, school-committee men, and constables.

Nor is this all. We urge sometimes the good citizens of our State to vote for a certain candidate for President of the United States, because we are in favor of administering the government of the State economically, or because we are or are not in favor of a certain rail-road or bridge, or of a certain police regulation. And then we urge the same citizens to vote for our candidates for State officers, because they are in favor of our Presidential candidate, or of our views of Federal policy. Admirable logic ! Then again, we hold the members of a given Federal party in one State responsible for the measures pursued by members of the same party in other States in regard to the action of their State government. We are not allowed to be democratic in one State, because those who agree with us in another State, on general politics, are anti-democratic in the bosom of their own State. The consequences of this are bad.

The administration party for instance, as a Federal party, has been in the main constitutional. Its measures have been just and proper; and it has deserved the support of all the friends of the Constitution. But in the bosom of the States themselves in regard to State legislation, it has been as anti-democratic as the whigs themselves; and, perhaps, to this fact, more than to any other, should be attributed its late disastrous defeat. It has called the whigs the bank party, and urged us to oppose them on that ground; but has it, on the other hand, been an anti-bank party? It has condemned the whigs; for advocating paper money, but has it ever opposed paper money? It has opposed a United States Bank; but on the broad ground of opposition to a paper currency? Has it not contended for State banks as strenuously, if not as openly, as have the whigs? What, then, has availed its opposition to a national bank? Aside from certain constitutional and political reasons, what arguments can you bring against a national bank, that do not bear with equal force against State banks? Nay, once admit the policy of a paper circulation, and it is questionable whether you are not unwise in opposing a national bank. If the States are to be suffered to issue, either directly or indirectly, through institutions of their own creating, a paper currency like the one we now have, it may be contended with justice, that a national bank is needed; nay, all but indispensable. Nothing can be worse than as many different currencies as there are States, and as many different currencies there will be, if the currency be left to State legislation. A principal reason for desiring a union of the States was, that we might have a currency which should not vary with each State, but be of uniform value throughout all the States. The people, in order to secure this end, placed the whole subject of the currency under the control of the Federal government. If we have decided that our currency shall be paper, assuredly it should come under the control of the Federal government. The interests of trade, nay, of industry, of labor, imperiously demand that the currency of Massachusetts and

of Mississippi should be of the Same value. Does anybody believe this can be the case, so long as our currency is paper, and this paper is issued by State institutions, and subject to the action of the State legislatures? It may be truly asserted, that a national bank cannot, under any circumstances, do much to remedy the evil; but there is no question but it can, to some degree, mitigate it. Its own notes will pass current, at the same value, throughout the Union, and thus afford a medium of exchange between the remote sections.

Now the administration party has opposed the United States Bank, without opposing paper money; it has sustained the paper money policy, while it has opposed the only measure which can possibly render that policy in any degree tolerable. This has been its error. If you have a paper currency, you are bound to place it under the control of the Federal government, by subjecting it to the direct or indirect action of that government. But the administration party has said, no, we will retain a paper currency, but we will leave it to the States to furnish it. Where, then, is the sound and uniform currency, for the furnishing of which the Federal government was created? Assuming that a paper currency is to be the currency of the country, Mr. Webster's arguments on this point are unanswerable, and have been so considered by a majority of the people of the United States.

The administration party in all the States, unless we except Massachusetts, has been as decidedly in favor of paper money as the whig party. There is nothing against it in any of the Messages of Andrew Jackson or Martin Van Buren; Senators Buchanan, Grundy, and King have taken unwearied pains to show that they are in favor of State banks, and what they call a mixed currency. Mr. Benton, the great antagonist of *the* Bank, has never said a syllable, as we can find, against paper money. The only opposition we have seen to the policy, in either branch of Congress, has come from Mr. Calhoun and some of his State Rights friends.

Leaving Congress and coming into the States, we find

the administration party, as a State party, nowhere opposing paper money. In Pennsylvania, the Governor, a friend of the administration, is also a friend of the banks; and the legislature which chartered the United States Bank of Pennsylvania, contained a majority of members friendly to Mr. Van Buren; in Ohio, the Governor, elected by the administration party, in his Message to the legislature last winter, sustained, on principle, at great length, and not without ability, the policy of paper money. Michigan has been all but ruined by banks, created while it was an administration State; Mississippi and Alabama have fared not much better, to say nothing of Illinois and Louisiana. The banking system of New York is a creation of the same party. and the whole influence of the New York banks was brought to bear against a national bank, and in favor of General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren, till the explosion of the Deposite System. In our own state, no man could maintain, prior to 1837, his standing in the administrarion party, if he were known to be opposed to paper money, and in favor of an exclusively metallic currency. We had our democratic banks, and the leading men of the party seemed to hold that banks were good things, providing they were managed by members of the democratic party. In fact, in no State in the Union, has the administration party assumed the character of an anti-paper-money party. Individuals there may have been, who, *sub rosâ*, would tell you that they were inclining to the belief, that we must return to a metallic currency, but the opposition to paper money has been purely an individual, and not a party opposition.

Several other matters, which have been made objections to the whigs, have also been encouraged by the administration party. This party has favored State loans, and aided in contracting those ruinous State debts, of which it now complains so much. The administration States have plunged as deeply into debt, to say the least, as the whig states. Witness New York, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Alabama, Illinois. Massachusetts, a thor-

ough-going whig State, has by no means been so rash; and furthermore, the policy of lending the credit of this Commonwealth to corporations has not been a purely whig measure. It has been sustained by some of our most influential administration men.

Now, as the confusion of State and Federal politics has made the party, as a Federal party, responsible for its action, as a State party, these facts have given it the appearance of gross inconsistency. As a State party it has had nothing to distinguish it from the whig party, unless it be professing more and aiming at less. As a Federal party, it has been tried not by the Constitution, but by its character as a State party. Its Federal policy, it has been seen, retaining its State policy, would be ruinous to trade, to business, and no advantage to labor. It, therefore, has had nothing to recommend it, and the people have decided against it. The people have not decided in favor of paper money, but simply, that, *if we have paper money, it shall not be left to the contradictory policy of State legislatures, but be under the control of the Federal government.* The Federal policy and the State policy of the party have not been harmonious, but parts of opposite systems. This has lost the party. The people are excellent logicians, great advocates for consistency, and require you always to be systematic, in whatever you propose. You cannot make them support one system in relation to one subject, and another system in relation to another subject. They demand Bank or no Bank; a paper currency of the best character the country can furnish, or a metallic currency. They will not lean toward a a metallic currency for the purpose of overthrowing a national bank, and toward a paper currency for the purpose of sustaining State banks. They cannot understand why the arguments which bear in favor of or against the one, do not bear equally in favor of or against the other.

The difficulty we have here pointed out can be removed, under our complex system of government, only by dissevering, as much as may be, the connexion which

has heretofore existed between the politics of the State, and the politics of the Union, and by making a man's views on Federal politics no criterion of his merits on questions of State politics. The doctrine of State Rights will hardly be maintained till we have done this. The tendency to consolidation, most to be feared, is not in the action of the Federal government, but in the conduct and sentiments of parties.

Keeping in view the distinction we have designated, we may speak on State policy, without committing in the least the friends of the Constitution in other States, whose views are different from our own. We hold them not responsible for the policy we advocate for our own State, and they must not hold us responsible for the policy they may choose to advocate. In the bosom of the several States, we are citizens of independent nations, in no sense accountable to one another.

In coming into the individual State, we can be at no loss to discover the policy marked out for the Democracy. The first question claiming our attention is undoubtedly that of the currency. This in itself is a miserable question, and one likes not to meddle with it; and yet its solution must be sought. If wise men neglect it, it will fall into the hands of fools, who will make bad work with it. We cannot blink it out of sight; we must meet it, and dispose of it. What disposition shall we make of it?

In the first place, we assume it as a settled point, that the control of the currency, so far as it falls under the action of government, is conceded by the States to the Union. The people of the United States wished, by the Union, to create for the citizens of all the States the same facilities of trade and business intercourse with one another, which they would have had, if they had all been citizens of one and the same State. They had also experienced great difficulties from the different policies pursued by the several States with regard to the currency. The States, each according to its own caprice, made what it pleased a legal tender for the payment of debts, and emitted its bills of credit almost

without limit. The currency therefore was constantly fluctuating, and varied in value as you passed from one State to another. The consequences of this on trade need not be told. The debts due from the citizens of one State to those of another, were of uncertain value; and when collected must be collected in a currency from which little or nothing could be realized, that the creditor could use in his own State, or at any point out of the State to which the debtor belonged.

The evils thus experienced the States sought to remedy, first, by surrendering the control of the currency to the Federal Government. By this they hoped to secure the same currency for all the States, a currency of the same value in every section of the Union. Secondly, to avoid the ruinous fluctuations of the currency, and to prevent the States from substituting any other currency than that of the Union, the States gave to the Federal Government no power to establish any other currency than that of gold and silver, and denied to themselves the right to create another, or to make anything else, a legal tender for the payment of debts.

From these facts, we infer, first, that under our present Constitution, the subject of the currency is surrendered entirely to the Federal Government; and second, that the Federal government has no right to establish any other than a hard money currency.

Now, under our present banking system, we have virtually, if not literally, a paper currency; and this currency is furnished by the States, and not by the general Government; and it is not only subject to ruinous fluctuations, but is of very unequal values, the currency of one section of the Union being at times five, ten, fifteen, even twenty per cent. better than that of another. Under the State Bank system, we have then a reproduction of the precise evils, against which the framers of the Constitution intended to guard. The introduction of another than a hard money currency is permitted, and the duty of furnishing the currency is resumed by the States.

In this case, of two things one; either the Federal Government must assume the control of these State banks, and regulate their issues by means of a grand bank of its own, or in some other way; or these banks must be given up. Given a paper money currency as the policy of the Country, we agree with Mr. Webster, that it should either be furnished, or what is the same thing, regulated by the Federal Government. But under the Constitution the Federal Government has no power to authorize, or to recognise in any way or shape anything like a paper currency. The only currency known to it is that of Gold and Silver. A national bank, or the furnishing of a paper currency by the Federal Government is then out of the question, if we mean to retain the Constitution. Besides, the establishment of a national bank would consolidate the money power, and give to the Federal Government a power it was never intended to have, a power which would make it the only efficient government of the Country, enable it to swallow up the States, and with them the liberties of the individual citizen. A paper currency furnished by the Federal Government, then, must not be thought of. But the States have no right to furnish a currency at all. They have surrendered that right. Then they have no right to create banks with the power to furnish it. Then the State banks, so far as they are banks of issue, are really if not technically unconstitutional, and therefore should cease to exist.

There is then no course for the Democracy to take, but either to consent to a national bank, or to abandon State banks. The first they will not do, and ought not to do. Then they must do the latter. Then they must take their stand openly, decidedly, and at once, against the State banks, so far as they are authorized to issue their notes as a circulation. In other words, the Democracy must take its stand against paper money, and against all institutions created for furnishing it. They must go for an exclusively metallic currency. Have they the nerve for this? The people have; but whether politicians have or have not, remains to be

seen. But if they have not, they may as well surrender at once to the enemies of the Democracy, and no longer keep up even a show of opposition.

Men on 'Change will no doubt smile at our simplicity in demanding a purely metallic currency, and tell us such a currency is impracticable, and undesirable; but in return we can assure them that we rarely go on 'Change to learn either democracy or political economy. The men who congregate there, are not usually the men whom God calls to enlighten the nations. They may understand the routine of business, but of the principles which lie at the bottom of their practice, their bearing on public morals and public prosperity, they know in general nothing. They are so busy in gathering up the acorns lying on the ground, that they have no time to cast their eyes up to the branches from which they have fallen, much less to investigate the laws by which they have been produced. If they were wise enough to afford valuable instructions on the currency, they were not foolish enough to encourage the growth of the system they now contend for.

We may be told that there is not gold and silver enough in the world to do the business with, that is now done. Very well; then do less business, and, perhaps, the world will be no worse off. But this pretence is shallow, and not worth refuting. The real objection is not what our business men allege. The difficulty is not that there is too little gold and silver in the world, but too little in their pockets. Increase the amount in the world a thousand fold, and their embarrassments would remain undiminished. Nor is this all. The use of paper does by no means supply the place of a metallic medium. The furnishing of paper money is a mere business transaction, requiring in the last analysis and absorbing in fact as much gold and silver as any other kind of business to an equal amount. The paper currency is not ultimate, and ends no transaction. It serves merely to defer the time of settlement; but it can pay no balances. The payment of balances, for which alone money is needed in the transaction of business, must be

paid, if paid at all, in gold and silver, in like manner as if no paper had been used; with this difference only, that these balances are rated according to the paper standard, and consequently require a larger amount of gold and silver to extinguish them, than would have been requisite, had gold and silver constituted the currency.

The difficulty, which our business men seek to obviate by paper money, is by no means a recondite one. They wish to buy and sell, and amass by the operation a fortune. But they have no money, with which to make their purchases, and no property which they can exchange for money. They have simply the faculty of buying and selling. They would buy and ship to England a cargo of cotton, and not pay the planter for it till it is sold in England and the returns realized. The merchant's means of payment must be obtained by the sale of the cotton purchased. What he wants, then, is credit. This credit, for various reasons, the planter will not give him. His simple course, then, is, to go to the capitalist, or to the bank, and borrow the means of paying the planter. It is well for him to obtain this loan, and no harm to the community. Credits to this extent are needed, and must be had, unless we would leave the whole business transactions of the world to a few moneyed men, a thing by no means desirable.

Banks are unquestionably, in this view of the case, necessary, and worthy of encouragement. If the business man can obtain the loan he asks for, it is an advantage to business, and to labor, for labor in certain respects has interests in common with business. A ready market for the products of labor is of as much importance to the laborer, as to the trader. In order to command this market, for the products of labor of any one country, it is necessary to open to them the markets of the world. And to do this requires an energy, an enterprise on the part of business men, which can be rarely looked for, except in young men, who have their fortunes to make. Facilities to these should unques-

tionably be extended, and for this banks, private or public, are necessary.

The Democracy, then, should not object to credit, nor to banks. We are willing the merchant should obtain a loan, and purchase his cargo of cotton, and not cancel his loan till the sale of the cotton has furnished him the means. All this can be assented to without difficulty. We would assign no limits to the credit he or others may obtain, but the means of those who grant it. So long as a bank loans only its actual capital, or real capital in its possession, we utter no complaint. Because then the planter is actually paid for his cotton, and the losses, if any, fall on the speculator and the bank, where they ought to fall. But by means of paper money, that is, by allowing the bank to loan its notes instead of loaning real money, the bank is enabled to furnish credits beyond its means of redemption. It ceases, the moment its notes exceed its actual amount of gold and silver on hand, to be a money-lender, and becomes a money-borrower, and dependent on the success of its debtors in their speculations, for the means to pay its creditors. If these speculations miscarry, the bank miscarries, and the actual loss falls, not on the speculator, for he had nothing to lose, nor on the bank, for it never furnished any real capital, but on the producer, who had exchanged his products for the notes of the bank. This is the feature in our banking system, which should be stricken out.

We have instanced the case of the speculator in cotton, who, wishing to speculate in that article, can only do it on credit. Now, it may be that this speculator can obtain no credit at the bank, or it may be, that the advance on the price paid for his cotton, at which he can sell it, will not be sufficient to furnish him a living profit, and at the same time pay the interest on his loan at the bank. What now shall be done? He, and four or five more in the same situation, but engaged in different business transactions, come together, petition the legislature, obtain a charter for a bank, with a privilege of issuing their notes to as great an amount, practically, as they can keep out.

They pay in the capital of the bank in stock notes, and now substituting their notes as a bank for their notes as individuals, purchase cotton and other products on their own credit. In this case they unite in themselves the character of speculators, borrowers, and lenders. They are their own bankers. The planter takes the notes of their bank for his cotton, which he sells to them as individuals, and the farmer for his wheat. But if they fail in their operations, as speculators, then they must fail as debtors of the bank, and then fail as the bank or debtors of the public, and what then has the planter and farmer received for their wheat and cotton?

But one knot of four or five individuals have obtained a bank, and by its means are commanding the products of industry with the same ease they would, had they been men of real capital. Other individuals, seeing this, say, why not we have a bank also? So these other individuals petition, and obtain a bank, and go through the same process. Another set of individuals do the same, till your whole State is covered over with banks, and the land deluged with bank notes. During this time the rage for speculation goes ever increasing; fortunes are made in a day; men who were poor clerks yesterday are millionaires to-day; slow but gradual gains are despised; honest industry is contemned, and all the world rushes into trade. But this cannot last. Balances must be paid, and paid in gold and silver; but gold and silver for this there is not enough to be come at. The few individuals, who, during the fever of speculation had taken good care not to have many outstanding balances to settle off, come out with a princely fortune, while the great mass of the active business men find themselves where they began; and the planters and farmers, find that they have nothing to show for the products they have parted with.

This is the inevitable result of a system of paper money, and this is a result no honest man can desire. This is carrying the credit system to a ruinous extent, and making that, which, within its natural limits, is a great good, one of the greatest of evils. Credit to this extent is

not needed, and should not be furnished. We must, then, abolish the paper money system, and compel the banks to limit their loans to their actual resources. The evil of banking begins the moment the bank becomes a borrower from the public at large, and this it does the moment it issues its notes beyond the actual amount of gold and silver in its possession. Beyond that amount its loans are loans of its credit, not of its money. Now we are willing that credits should be obtained by the business men to the full extent of the actual means of those who furnish them. This is the natural limit to the credit system, and beyond which it can never be safe. When extended beyond this limit, the business of the country is unnaturally stimulated, and rendered unhealthy ; its frame becomes bloated, and sudden dissolution is always to be apprehended.

We come, then, to this conclusion ; the Democracy need not oppose banking, but it should oppose paper money ; it need not oppose credit, without which all business must come to a stand-still, but it should oppose all artificial means for extending credits beyond the ability of those who furnish them to redeem them in gold and silver. We make no objections to banks of deposit, of exchange, transfer of credits, and of discount ; we simply ask that all discounts be made in the legal currency of the country.

This, if it were but the existing order, we shall be told, would unquestionably be far preferable to our present state of things. But, then, it is useless to contend for it. So large a proportion of the people are in debt, that they will never submit to the sacrifice necessary for introducing it. This may be so. Yet the losses to the debtor class of the community, we do not believe, would be greater than they have been for the last few years. Then, again, can we not arrive at a tolerably exact estimate of the per cent., at which this change would appreciate the currency ? Why not, then, require the creditor, in the case of all debts contracted prior to the change, and estimated in a depreciated paper currency, to deduct this per cent. from the nominal

amount claimed? This would be just to both parties, requiring the debtor to pay only the amount of value he had stipulated to pay, and giving the creditor all the values be had ever a right to demand.

But, if we go against all paper money, what shall we do with existing banks? Repeal, of course, that clause in their charters, which allows them to issue their notes as a currency, and require the immediate redemption, in gold and silver, of the notes they have now in circulation. This, we admit, is a bold measure, and cannot be adopted at once, without causing great suffering. But what of that? It is better to take a medicine, which will expel a lingering disease and restore us to health, although its immediate operation shall give us the gripes, than it is to be always sick. What is true in this respect of the individual, is of the community. It is better to feel the full shock of the evil at once, and then to be ever after free from it, than it is to be constantly debilitated by it. But be this as it may, a healthy state of business cannot be obtained at a less expense.

Having disposed of the currency question, and by annihilating all banks of circulation, brought the currency to the constitutional standard, we must extirpate all monopolies, not necessarily all corporations. Corporations are useful, and answer many desirable purposes. All that Democracy can ask in regard to them is, that they conceal no monopoly principle, that they confer on the corporator no privileges, which he did not possess or may not possess as an individual. We would, therefore, insist that the individual property of all the corporators should be holden for the debts of the corporation.

Corporations, for manufacturing purposes, are not strictly anti-democratic, when their charters confer no monopoly; and yet they exert an anti-democratic influence. Their tendency at present is unwholesome. Nevertheless, they are founded on a principle destined to play an important part in the business of production, that of *associated labor*. They are but a feeble, a most imper-

fect embodyment of this principle ; but they contain the germ of it, and we should therefore seek to perfect them, and not to destroy them. When we can make them corporations, as we may, of operatives and employers in the same persons, and not of employers alone, they will be great blessings.

Banks are at present monopolies, for they have the privilege of making a use of their credit, which is denied to individuals. But when they cease to be banks of issue, and restrict themselves to the ordinary functions of banking, that is, to negotiating loans and exchanges, they will not necessarily be monopolies, and may be suffered to exist. If, however, they are found to have any privilege, which an individual has not, or which he can have only by becoming a member of them as bodies corporate, they should be modified, and this principle taken away,

Monopolies disposed of, many other questions will come up. The reforms we need are in very few cases political. By political reforms, we understand reforms in the organization of the state. A few of these may, perhaps, be needed. The right of suffrage needs some extension, and, perhaps, the judiciary some constitutional changes. But the principal questions which come up relate not to political, but legislative reforms. There are several of these, which we intended to specify, but we have already exceeded our limits. We can only add, that we must complete the abolition of imprisonment for debt, and revise our laws relating to the collection of debts. The expenses annually incurred by the collection of debts by law exceed the amount of debts so collected. These expenses are borne chiefly by the debtor class, already embarrassed ; and serve to maintain a set of legal harpies, which public morality would willingly dispense with altogether. Why should not all ordinary debts be regarded as mere individual matters, which are to be adjusted by individuals, without calling in the aid of society ? Why not leave the whole subject to individual probity and honor ? If so left, the demand

for these virtues would be increased, and thereby public and private morality be promoted.

Reforms in the criminal code are demanded. We cannot specify them now; we can only say that our criminal code should be made to harmonize with the principle, that human governments have no right to punish, except for the purpose of restraint from actual violence, done either to individual rights, or social.

In fine, we must insist upon a system of education, combining industry with science and literature. Or, in one word, a system of industrial schools, in which some branch of industry shall be pursued, in connexion with literature and science. Schools of this kind are needed for ennobling labor. When all the children of the commonwealth labor, labor will be honorable. They are needed for the promotion and preservation of health. A few hours' labor every day are essential to the health of the student. They are also needed in order to enable each child in the commonwealth to have access to the best education the community can afford. They may easily be made self-supporting schools, and cost the state nothing, and then education may be really universal.

Some other things we would specify, but we have said enough. What we have said indicates that the Democracy has a great work to perform, and that it cannot engage too soon, nor be too much in earnest to perform it.

Doubtless, some will dissent from the policy we have marked out, the measures we have suggested. Be it so. We have merely given our own views, freely and boldly. We have told what we honestly think the Democracy should attempt, stated the ground on which it should rally, and some of the measures, on which it should insist. If others think us wrong, wild, rash, impracticable, or wicked, all we have to say is, let them bring forward something better. But, whatever they have to propose, let them be speedy. Time flies. The enemy is already in our midst, has already entrenched himself in some of our strong holds, and threatens to

bring us under his accursed dominion. Friends of the Constitution and of Equal Rights, be on the alert. You have no time to waste. Now, or never, must you recover your kingdom, and establish your empire. Now, or never, must you seize upon a true democratic policy, and stake everything on one bold effort to save the Constitution, and establish the reign of Justice and Equality.

Art. IV. — *An Address of the Workingmen of Charlestown, Mass., to their Brethren throughout the Commonwealth and the Union.* 1840. 8vo. pp. 18.

This Address was published on the eve of the late elections, and has no doubt been thrown aside with the mass of ephemeral productions, which they called forth; but it seems to us to have been designed not merely for electioneering purposes, and to be worthy of grave consideration, even now that the elections are over. We cannot perceive that it has lost much in interest or appropriateness.

In 1829, the workingmen, mechanics, and other laborers, in the city of New-York, organized themselves into a party, put forth a declaration of principles, and succeeded in electing one of their men to the State Legislature. Their movement created considerable excitement at the time; and was speedily followed by similar movements in various sections of the Union. There was even a moment, when this party seemed not unlikely to become a dominant party in the country. It was sustained by several leading journals of the then National Republican party, as well as by several of its own, conducted with great spirit and ability, and somewhat extensively circulated. But as an organized party, it proved to be short-lived, and soon became almost entirely merged in one or both of the great political parties, which then divided the country.

This workingmen's party owed its origin to the insufficiency of the democratic party of the time to meet the new democratic wants of the country. The questions, which had given rise to the old Federal and Republican parties of '98, had in 1829 well nigh lost their hold on the popular mind; and new questions, of far graver import, had come up, or were struggling to come up, for practical solution. The Federal and Republican parties were purely *political* parties, and the questions on which they divided related almost entirely to the organization of the State. At the epoch of the adoption of the Constitution, men honestly differed in their views of the form which should be given to the government. Hamilton and his friends, believing it the main duty of government to provide for itself, its own permanence and stability, were for giving it as much of an aristocratic cast, as the habits of our people would permit. They wished to protect the government from the fickleness and turbulence of the Democracy. Thomas Jefferson and his friends, inspired by an ardent love of freedom, and reposing a generous confidence in the people, leaned the other way, and sought to establish a pure Democracy. But in 1829, the controversy between these two parties had virtually subsided. Both parties had accepted the democratic form of government; each claimed to be the democratic party; and it was no easy matter to say whether the claims of the one were better founded than those of the other. Democracy, as a form of government, had triumphed over all its enemies, and become the established creed of the country, which nobody thought of disturbing.

But Democracy, as a form of government, *political* Democracy, as we call it, could not be the term of popular aspiration. Regarded in itself, without reference to anything ulterior, it is no better than the aristocratic form of government, or even the monarchical. Universal suffrage and eligibility, the expression of perfect equality before the State, and which with us are very nearly realized, unless viewed as means to an end, are not worth contending for. What avails it, that all men

are equal before the State, if they must stop there? If under a Democracy, aside from mere politics, men may be as unequal in their social condition, as under other forms of government, wherein consist the boasted advantages of your Democracy? Is all possible good summed up in suffrage and eligibility? Is the millennium realized, when every man may vote and be voted for? Yet this is all that political Democracy, reduced to its simplest elements, proposes. Political Democracy, then, can never satisfy the popular mind. This Democracy is only one step, — a necessary step, — in its progress. Having realized equality before the State, the popular mind passes naturally to equality before Society. It seeks and accepts *political* Democracy only as a means to *social* Democracy, and it cannot fail to attempt to realize equality in men's social condition, when it has once realized equality in their political condition.

But prior to 1829, no attempt had been made to realize this social Democracy; no party had recognised it; no prominent politician had avowed it. Parties and politicians were continuing on in their old beaten track, repeating till hoarse their old war-cries, without once dreaming, that to the popular mind these war-cries had lost their significance. They perceived not, that the day, when the cry of Federal or Republican could decide the fate of an election, had gone by. Indeed, up to this day, our politicians have not pereeived this, and many is the friend of the Administration, who, during the late canvass, has thought to annihilate the supporters of General Harrison by shouting Hartford Convention, and Old Federalism. But this shouting has availed nothing, for the questions laboring in the public mind are not the old political questions which originated the Federal and Republican parties. A new phase of the mighty revolution, which has for the last seven hundred years been going on throughout all Christendom, has come up, and one which our politicians see not even now, but which they especially saw not in 1829. If the political democrats of that time had seen this new phase,

and conformed to it, recognised these new wants, and manifested a desire to meet them, no new party would have been needed, none could have arisen. But as they did not, the friends of progress, and especially they in whom these new wants were the most urgent, were compelled to break away from the political Democrats, and set up for themselves. Hence the Workingmen's Party.

The party failed in consequence of its assuming a name, which seemed to be at war with the end it avowed, and in consequence of the friendship which the other parties soon professed to have for its objects, its principles, and measures. The name, Workingmen, was either too unlimited, or too restricted. In one sense, all men in this country are workingmen ; in this sense, a workingmen's party is without significance. In another sense, it means only actual operatives, men who have no means of subsistence, but their simple labor ; that is to say, the proletaries. But in this sense it includes a large number, who will never make any efforts for themselves, and excludes a large number, who are the most earnest and effective supporters of social Democracy. And moreover, by assuming the name of a particular class of society as the name of the party, it seemed to indicate that the object of the party was to protect a special interest, and all men have a righteous horror of protecting special interests, — unless they be the special interests of the rich and powerful. Then, again, the other parties, especially the administration party, by professing great regard for the workingmen, making them fair promises, and supporting some of their prominent friends, created a feeling that a separate workingmen's party was unnecessary, and as a matter of course prevented the exertions, without which the party could not be sustained. In these considerations, we may possibly discover the secret of its failure.

But, though the workingmen as a party were soon disbanded, the friends of their principles and measures have not become extinct. Social Democracy has been constantly on the spread, and the numbers of its adherents

steadily augmenting. The Address before us seems to have been designed to rally these, by flinging again to the breeze the old Workingmen's Flag of 1829. The social Democrats constitute the main body of the administration party, together with no inconsiderable portion of the supporters of General Harrison. If they could all be drawn out, and united on the same side, they would unquestionably constitute a majority of the voters in the Union. They would then be able to possess themselves of the government, and to use it for the furtherance of their purposes. This, we presume, our Charlestown friends have seen, and therefore have published their Address.

Will these social Democrats rally under the old Workingmen's Flag? We know not, but we hardly think they will. Even the workingmen themselves will rally under their own Flag only to a limited extent. It is no easy matter to induce them to make an effort in their own behalf. They are, in general, much falser to themselves, than the Aristocracy are to them. With many honorable exceptions, indeed, our workingmen have already become so dependent and servile in their spirit, that not much can be done with them. They are afraid of displeasing their masters, or of losing their employments, and are readiest to distrust those who are readiest to sacrifice themselves for their interests. When the master or agent is out of hearing, they will assent to your propositions, but will change their tone or remain silent, when he is present. They also want confidence in one another; and with their present passions and habits, they seem incapable of acting steadily in concert for any length of time. We, therefore, have no great confidence in the charm of this old Flag. We doubt whether it has any magic, and, therefore, should not ourselves fling it out.

Our policy would be a little different. We believe that all the social Democrats may be drawn out and united; nay, they will and shall be; for so is it written in this nation's destiny. But we find the great body of them already enrolled, and marching under a banner

which seems to us sufficiently appropriate. The administration party has been called by its enemies the Loco-foco party. This term, Loco-foco, has properly belonged only to a portion of the party. The party has been composed of political Democrats, and of social Democrats. To these social Democrats the term *loco-foco* was first applied, and to them alone it belongs, though it has been improperly extended to pretty much the whole party. As the political Democratic party, it has been defeated, and may be considered as good as dead; but as the Loco-foco party, it is not dead, nor likely to die. Its defeat will send out from its midst all who are unable or unwilling to pass from political Democracy to social Democracy; but the social Democrats, who constitute three-fourths of the party, will remain, and be the nucleus, as well as the main body of the new party, which must inevitably come up to rule the destinies of the country. These, the real Loco-focos, will not be gathered to any other body, because they themselves constitute a larger body than any other, with which they can have any affinity. Instead, then, of flinging out the old Workingmen's Flag, or patching up and giving again to the breeze the torn ensign of purely political Democracy, we would accept the genuine Loco-foco Flag, already streaming in the wind, and which nobody thinks of pulling down. On this Loco-foco Flag, if we read aright, is inscribed, EQUALITY BEFORE SOCIETY, AS WE ALREADY HAVE EQUALITY BEFORE THE STATE. Loco-focoism is social Democracy, as distinguished from political; and a Loco-foco is a Jeffersonian Democrat, who having realized political equality, passed through one phase of the revolution, now passes on to another, and attempts the realization of social equality, so that the actual condition of men in society shall be in harmony with their acknowledged rights as citizens.

Loco-focoism is, then, the word, and its banner the one, under which we would attempt to rally the Social Democracy, especially since under it are already enrolled the larger division of them. We are also partial to the

term. It was applied to the friends of social equality by their enemies, as a term of reproach, for the purpose of rendering them odious or ridiculous. We would therefore accept it, and make it our battle cry, till its faintest whisper should strike terror into the heart of every man, who would lord it over his brother. It is a good word, and it was applied to the social Democrats because they chose to carry their own light, and not be dependent on their conservative brethren; because they would not suffer themselves to be kept in darkness, that aspiring chiefs might manage them. We like the term; we are willing to wear it, and we glory in its significance. It shall be a famous word yet, more so than that of Guelph or Ghibbeline, or Whig or Tory, and like Liberty herself, shall make the "tour of the globe." We would raise aloft then the genuine Loco-foco Flag; we would let it stream in the wind from every liberty-pole in every town, village, and hamlet in the Union. No dishonor stains it; it has witnessed no defeat; it is new, and whole, and strong. Under it we may fight and win the battle of man and society. This we would recommend as the best policy. Nevertheless, the old Workingmen's Flag may have a charm we wot not of. At any rate, with the end these Workingmen have in view, we entirely and heartily sympathize. It is an end to which all modern civilization is tending; which is hastened by every revolution, whatever may be its apparent termination; which is sanctioned by religion, and demanded by the blood of the Cross; for which all good men pray, and labor the world over; and which no power beneath the Almighty can hinder from being one day attained. Go on, then, whether ye call yourselves Workingmen or Loco-focos. You are marching with Humanity, and you march to victory.

Willing to aid our friends the Workingmen what we can, we copy their Address nearly entire. We think our readers will not object. It appears to us to be written with great calmness and dignity, and evidently by one who spoke from his own deep feelings and firm convictions. Its tone is earnest, grave, and almost solemn.

We commend it to the careful perusal of our readers, belong they to what class of society they may.

"Brethren: — The time seems to have arrived, when we, the real workingmen of the country, should pause, and survey our condition; ascertain our actual state, what are our rights, and the means of securing their full enjoyment.

"We are in this country, as in all others, the great majority of the population. We are the real producers. By our toil and sweat, our skill and industry, is produced all the wealth of the community. We have felled the primeval forests of this western world, converted them into fruitful fields, and planted the rose in the wilderness. We have erected these cities and villages which smile where lately was the Indian's wigwam, or the lair of the wild beast. We have called into existence American manufactures, and been the instruments by which Commerce has amassed her treasures; our labor has digged the canals, and constructed the railways, which are intersecting the country in all directions, and opening its resources. We have built and manned the ships which navigate every ocean, and furnished the houses of the rich with all their comforts and luxuries. Our labor has done it all. And yet what is our condition? We toil on from morning to night, from one year's end to another, increasing our exertions with each year, and with each day, and still we are the poor and dependent. Here, as everywhere else, they, who pocket the proceeds of our labor, look upon us as the lower class, and term us the mob. We are but laborers, operatives, *vulgar* workingmen. We are poor. Our wages barely suffice to supply us the necessaries of life. We rarely have either leisure or opportunity to cultivate our minds, or to acquire that general knowledge of men and things, which no human being should grow up without. We are doomed by our position to grow up ignorant, and often in total neglect of all our nobler endowments. Our rights and interests attract no general attention. Legislators have no leisure to attend to our wants. And politicians have no further concern with us, than to wheedle us out of our votes by fair speeches and vague promises. The great concern is to take care of the rich and prosperous, the educated and powerful — of those who fill the high places of society, ride in carriages, sit on cushioned seats, and feast their dainty palates on luxuries culled from every clime. The wants of these are urgent. *Their* rights, privileges, and interests will brook no delay. But we, we, who bear all the burdens of society, pay all the revenues of Government, and the incomes of the rich, why we may go our way till a more convenient season.

"Now, Brethren, against this state of things, we enter a loud, an indignant protest. Our pockets may be empty, our faces may be sunburnt, and our hands may be hard; but we are men, with the souls of men, and the rights of men. There is a spirit within us, that assures us we were not born to be slaves; that we were not made merely to toil and sweat, to endure hunger, and cold, and nakedness, and death, that the few might grow fat on our labors and sufferings, and then turn round and kick us. We feel that we

were made for something better, and that we have a right to aspire to something higher. An apostle has said, "If any man will not work, neither shall he eat." And this we believe should apply to one man as well as to another. Why, if we must bear all the burthens of society, shall we not in common justice enjoy all its blessings?

"Brethren, we have reflected on our condition, and we have come to the conclusion, that it is not the true condition of men. We are made of the same blood with those who work us as they do their horses and oxen, and who value us only for the profit they can derive from our labors. As pure blood courses in our veins as in theirs; as generous, as noble emotions swell our bosoms, and we have by nature capacities, to say the least, every way equal to theirs. Why then are they regarded as the better sort? Why then do they fatten on our labors? Why then are they rich and we poor? Why shall not our condition be as good as theirs? Why shall they call themselves our masters, and work us for their profit?

"Brethren, we have said that we are men. We have then the rights of men — we are then by virtue of our rights, equal to one another, and to all men.

"The rights of men belong to us by virtue of the fact that we are men. We hold them not by the grant of civil society; they are anterior to civil society; and in coming into civil society, we do not surrender them, nor can we be justly deprived of their exercise.

"We hold that every man by virtue of the simple fact that he is a man, a human being, has a right to all the means necessary for the free and full development of all his faculties, and for providing for his moral, intellectual, and physical well-being.

"Before God, all men are equal, — are children of a common parent; for one God hath made them all, and all are his offspring. Before the Gospel all men are equal, for one and the same Saviour hath died for them all; and the same faith, repentance, and means of salvation are preached to them all, and declared to be equally necessary to them all. Before society, then, should all men be regarded as equals. Consequently, the burthens of society and the blessings of society should be shared equally by all.

"Government is not society, but the agent of society. Its true end is to secure to each individual member of society the full enjoyment of his rights, and to ensure the due performance of each one's social duties. It is false to its trust whenever it leaves any individual in a condition below that which is proper to man; whenever any individual is left without the power to protect his rights, and to attain according to his aptitude to the full development of his nature as a moral, intellectual, and physical being.

"Brethren, in saying all this, we say only what all our countrymen admit. Our rights are acknowledged — *in words;* but what avails the acknowledgment of our *rights*, when we want the MIGHTS to maintain them. It is with us a question as to our MIGHTS, rather than as to our RIGHTS. Nobody dare deny our rights; but our rights are trampled upon, because it is thought we have not the power to punish the aggressor. Here then is the difficulty. We

are men with the rights of men, with rights equal to those of the wealthiest and the proudest; but we are poor men; men obliged to labor for our daily bread; dependent on those who choose to employ us, and compelled by the invincible law of hunger to accept the wages they offer. They hold us then at their mercy, and make us work solely for their profit. Here, not *our rights*, but our *mights* fail us.

"How stands the case with us? We labor more hours and with more intensity than we did formerly. We are aided by the discoveries of science, and the introduction of machinery which gives to our labor a thousand fold additional power of production; and yet our condition relatively to the capitalist does by no means become better. There is scarcely a country in Europe where, in proportion to the labor they perform, the laboring classes are worse off than they are here. If we worked no more hours in a day, no more days in a week, and with no more intensity, than do the Italian peasants, we should find ourselves in a condition scarcely superior to theirs. We receive only about the same proportion of the proceeds of our labor.

"Moreover everything is tending to reduce the workingmen of this country to the condition they are sunk to in the old world. And what is that condition? In England, Scotland, and Wales, fourteen millions of the population, it is said, are obliged to subsist on an annual income of about ninety dollars a year and under. Five millions of these subsist on an annual income of less than twenty-five dollars each. In some counties in England, prior to the new poor laws, the paupers amounted to 63 per cent. on the whole population, and in Liverpool every third individual was in indigence. Of Ireland, we need say nothing more than that one third of the whole population experience a deficiency of even third rate potatoes for thirty weeks out of fifty-two. In France, out of a population of about thirty-two millions, nearly thirty-one millions receive an annual income of under seventy-five dollars each; seven millions five hundred thousand, under twenty-five dollars; seven millions five hundred thousand, about eighteen dollars each. The expense of living is higher in England than in this country, and probably about one fourth less in France. But what must be the condition of the laboring classes even in France, where it is better than in England, and perhaps as good as in any country in Europe with the exception of Belgium?

"Now, what saves us from a similar condition? We are saved from a similar condition mainly by the paucity of our numbers, and the superior freedom of our industry, which creates a greater competition among capitalists, and therefore a greater demand for laborers. But this competition is less among manufacturers than it was. The principal manufacturers having adopted in regard to labor nearly uniform prices, rarely bid upon one another. The multiplication of large corporations is rapidly changing the whole character of our laboring population, by bringing them under the control of corporate bodies. These corporations check individual enterprise, lessen competition between individual capitalists, bind the capital-

ists together in close affinity af interest, and enable them to exert a sovereign control over the prices of labor. Let these corporations continue to increase for a few years longer, and they will be able to reduce our wages to the minimum of human subsistence. There will grow up around them a population bearing but little resemblance to that which won our political independence. It will be enfeebled in mind and body, and without either the mental or physical energy to shift its employment, or to make a firm stand for the amelioration of its condition.

"Hitherto the great mass of our laboring population has been bred in the agricultural districts, and consequently could easily shift from the city or the factory village to the farm. But this will not continue to be the case for another generation. Nor is this all. Lands are monopolized; the whole earth is foreclosed. However well disposed the laborer might be to cultivate the soil, he has not the means of becomming its owner. He has no spot on which to erect him a cabin, or on which he may raise a few potatoes to feed his wife and little ones; for the broad hands of the few cover it all over.

"Nor can we stop here. It would seem that the more we produced the better should be our condition. But this is not the fact except for short seasons. We suffer from over-production. To-day the supply is small, and the demand is brisk, we find employment and receive tolerable wages. But a hundred capitalists have rushed simultaneously into the work of producing; all hands are employed; forthwith the demand is supplied; the market is glutted; sales are diminished; and the diminished sales return upon us in the shape of a reduction of wages. To make up for this reduction of wages, we must labor more hours, or with greater intensity, and increase the amount of our production; and this increased amount of production, returns upon us again in the shape of a still farther reduction of our wages; and thus on, till they are reduced to the lowest point compatible with our existence.

"Brethren, put these things together, and tell us, if the natural tendency in this country is not to reduce us, and that at no distant day, to the miserable condition of the laboring classes in the old world? We stand on the declivity; we have already begun to descend! What is to save us?

"Brethren, this is a question of fearful import to us and our children. It is a question we must put to ourselves in sober earnest. It is a question we must put *now*, for a little more delay and it will be TOO LATE. Is it not already too late? God forbid! We will not believe it too late; but we feel that not a moment is to be lost. Now or never, must our salvation be secured. How shall it be done?

"Brethren, our salvation must, through the blessing of God, come from ourselves. It is useless to expect it from those whom our labors enrich. It is for their interest to augment our numbers and our poverty. It is their interest to purchase our labor at the lowest rate possible; it is ours to sell it at the highest rate possible. Their interest and ours, then, stand in direct opposition to each other. The greater our numbers, the more necessitous our con-

dition, the greater is the facility with which they can obtain laborers, and the lower the price they are obliged to pay for labor. The fewer our numbers, the more independent our condition, the higher is the price we can demand and obtain for our labor. This refutes the pretensions of the aristocracy, that their interests and ours are one and the same. As men, as human beings, no doubt their interest and ours are the same; but their interests as capitalists, and ours as laborers, are directly opposite, and mutually destructive. In fact there is less identity of interest between the capitalists and us, than there is between the master and the slave. The slave is the master's property, and it is for the master's interest to take care of his property; it is for his interest to give his slave a sufficiency of food, and to be careful not to overwork him; for the sickness or death of his slave would be a loss of property. The same principle, which leads a man to take good care of his horses, sheep, and oxen, would lead him to take good care of his slaves. But the capitalist has no other interest in us, than to get as much labor out of us as possible. We are hired men, and hired men, like hired horses, have no souls. If a man owns the horse he drives, he will take care not to injure him; but if the horse be a hired one, what he will do, is told in a common saying, "Hired horses have no souls; drive on." "Hired men have no souls; drive on." If we sicken and die, the loss is ours, not the employer's. *There are enough more ready to take our places.*

"Brethren, we conjure you, therefore, not to believe a word of what is said about your interest and that of your employers being the same. Your interests and theirs are in the nature of things, hostile and irreconcilable. Then do not look to them for relief. Be not so mad as to suppose that they will voluntarily work out your salvation for you. You must expect them to be governed mainly by their own interests, and must never rely on their doing, as a body, what it is not for their interest to do. If then you have ever expected the capitalist, the accumulator, contractor, and employer, to conspire to elevate your condition, expect it no longer. As well might the poor and depressed have expected the Gospel, which is good news to the poor, from the scribes and pharisees, the chief priests and elders, who crucified Jesus for proclaiming it. Where, then, shall we look?

"Shall we look to politicians? What have politicians done for us, during the last fifty years? They have talked much about the rights, interests, and dignity of labor; they have had smiling faces, soft voices, and fair speeches for us; but what have *they* DONE for us? We want DEEDS, not *words*; *deeds* not promises. Only two measures, having special reference to the laboring classes, have as yet been carried, or even partially carried by our politicians; one the extension of the elective franchise, and the other a mitigation, for we cannot call it the abolition, of imprisonment for debt. This is all that the American politicians have as yet done, to carry out the American system, and to reduce to practice the great truth, that "all men are created equal." Politicians can therefore, give but a poor accout of themselves. All parties profess to have a special

affection for our interests, and assure us that, if we will give them our suffrages, our interests shall be protected; but thus far whichever party has succeeded at the polls, the interest of the capitalist has been sure to triumph in the halls of legislation and at the tribunals of justice. Politicians want our votes; but, when they have obtained our votes, we are the least of their concern. Nothing is to be hoped from politicians; unless we give them to understand, that our votes are for them only on one condition; namely, *that they wed themselves, indissolubly, to our interests*, which are in fact the true interests of all men, viewed simply as men.

"What have we to hope from the political parties of the day, each of which is vociferating its friendship for us? From the whig party we have nothing to hope. It represents the interests of the capitalist, of the employer, and, therefore, interests directly adverse to ours. Its professions of regard for the poor laborer, we understand and despise. We have heard them too often to be able to confide in them; we have, and can have, no confidence in those who feel that to take us by the hand it is necessary for them to *descend*. Nobody will be true to us, who does not feel in his soul, that his feet stand on the same level with ours. We have, then, nothing to hope from the whigs. And so far as we can see, they have not the shadow of a claim to our suffrages.

"What have we to hope from the democratic party? Certainly, if there be any difference, more than we have from the whig party. We are far from having entire confidence in the leaders of the democraitc party, so called. We could find no little fault with many of them. They seem to us to have no clear conceptions and no ardent love of the great doctrine of equality, on which they harp so much; and we trust we do them no wrong, when we say that they will defend equal rights only so far as is necessary to place themselves in office. A considerable portion of the democratic party differ from the whigs only in name. They have the same attachment to banks, corporations, and high tariffs; and if they could have their way, government would still be administered in the interests of business, not of labor. Nevertheless, at the present moment, there is apparently no little preference due to the administration party. So far as it concerns the General Government, this party appears to us to have adopted just principles. It adheres to the Constitution; and labors to restrict the General Government to the few, but important purposes, for which it was originally instituted. It favors State rights; and opposes any encroachment upon them, not only by the Federal Executive, but also by Congress and the Federal Judiciary. It opposes a national bank, and provides for the collecting, keeping, and disbursing the public revenues, without recourse to banks, or the business of banking. It also opposes a national debt, and, we believe, a protective tariff. It would leave all the great interests of the country to the protection of the natural and immutable laws of trade. This is much, and all that we can ask of the General Government.

"It is not from the action of the General Government that we are to look for relief. The matters which chiefly concern us come not

within its province. Its aid to us can be at best only negative. All we can ask of it is, that it shall adopt no measures injurious to us. In the hands of the present party we have no such measures to apprehend. The administration has shown itself well disposed towards the laborer; and as it knows that it must rely for its support mainly on our suffrages, we have no fears of its failing to do for us, all it can do constitutionally.

"If we come into our own State, we still have nothing to hope from the whigs. We know the views of their candidate for Governor. He professes to be our friend; but he has proposed no method of befriending us, but the establishment of a high tariff to increase the profit of the capitalist, and a national bank to inflate still more the currency, to enhance the prices of whatever we must buy, and reduce our wages still lower. So far as our salvation is to be effected by the agency of Government, it must be done by the State Governments; of course then we should take a greater interest in the constitution and administration of the State Governments than in those of the Federal Government. Are the views of the present democratic party in this State, such as should meet our approbation? In the abstract they are. But we cannot deny that we find not so much explicitness as to actual measures as we could wish. Were we asked what the party proposes to do in case it comes into power, we should be somewhat puzzled to answer. Some of its prominent members have occasionally leaned quite too far towards the aristocracy, and advanced doctrines which we do not entertain. Nevertheless, we find in the party much to approve. Their candidate for Governor, our present Chief Magistrate, has proved that his sympathies, up to a certain point, are with the workingmen. He has declared himself opposed to the present iniquitous banking system, which is much, although he may not have declared so fully his views concerning what should be adopted in its place. He has declared himself opposed to the favorite plan of the Stockjobbers, of loaning the credit of the State to corporations, and he has ably opposed the whole system of corporations, of which we have complained. He states it to be the duty of government to aim to introduce the greatest practicable equality among all the members of the community; he is in favor of universal suffrage, and contends that representation is a right of *man* and not of *property*. His Address to the Legislature at the last session was, in the main, unexceptionable, the most thoroughly democratic, in its spirit and tendency, of any Governor's Message, which has ever fallen under our notice; and we have reason to believe that it was generally satisfactory to the workingmen throughout the Union. A more unexceptionable candidate it would not be easy to select; and we have no reason to apprehend that in his hands the Government would be turned against us. So far as we know his views, they go in the right direction, although they may possibly fall short of our own. When the question comes up, as it now does, whether the workingmen shall vote for him or his whig competitor, it seems to us that no workingman can hesitate a moment to prefer Marcus Morton to John Davis.

"But, brethren, although we may give our votes to the administration party in the present crisis as *the best we can do*, we must not sink ourselves in that party and suffer its leaders to lead us whithersoever they please. We must take our own stand, independent of both existing parties; adopt our own principles; propose our own measures; and support this or that party only so far as we have the surest pledges the nature of the case will admit, that by so doing we shall be doing something for the interests of labor. We must assume a position, as we may, from which we can make our own terms with the politicians of either party. Our interests have been neglected long enough; they must be neglected no longer. We can no longer consent to labor merely to elevate our masters. We must say to the whig party, and to the democratic party; Here are our measures, here is what we demand; the party which will pledge itself honestly to our measures, and faithfully pursue them, shall have our suffrages; but no other party shall. We take our stand with our principles and measures; with them we will triumph, or bear defeat.

"Brethren, in order to be able to assume this position, we must organize ourselves, and act in concert. The privileged classes have always prevailed against us, though we are the many and they the few, because they have combined their numbers and acted together. We must not disdain to follow their example, so far as to combine in our own defence. We would, therefore, recommend to our brethren throughout the Commonwealth and the Union, to organize themselves into associations, which, by mutual correspondence, may bring about a concert of action between all the workingmen of the country. We would recommend that the workingmen in each town, or city, or village, should form themselves into an association for mutual improvement and protection. The association should have its Constitution, By-Laws, and Officers. Its officers may be more or fewer as each association may judge best; but one of them should be a Corresponding Secretary, through whom the assosiciation may correspond with sister associations. When the association has organized itself, let it draw up a declaration of Rights; and then let it meet once a week, if convenient, for the discussion of the principles and measures necessary to be adopted for securing to each individual member of the community at large, the full and practical enjoyment of his rights. In this way we shall be improving our minds, enlarging our knowledge, und preparing ourselves to act understandingly in defence of our rights and interests.

"In this way, too, we shall constitute ourselves a Power in the State, and a power which no party will dare offend. In this way we shall make ourselves strong enough to command that respect from politicians and statesmen, which we deserve, and to make them fear to postpone our just claims.

"No doubt the aristocracy will cry out against a proposal like the one we have suggested. No matter; they have combined for ages against us. Turn about is fair play. We will now combine in our own defence, and see which will triumph, a combination of MEN or a combination of WEALTH.

"Brethren, we throw out these suggestions for your consideration. Our interests are the same; our sufferings are similar; and the means needed for our relief are identical. Let us then understand one another. Let us put our heads, our hearts, and our shoulders together. Let us become a band of brothers, sworn to stand by one another in good report and in evil, in life and in death, With our interests are identified those of the race. The well-being of all the future generations of our countrymen is committed to us. Let us then be true to ourselves, and in being true to ourselves, and to one another, we shall be true to our country, to our God, and to universal man."

Art. V. LITERARY NOTICES.

Social Destiny of Man: Or Association and Reorganization of Industry. Our Evils are Social not Political; — Political Evils are results of the false Organization of Society. By Albert Brisbane. Philadelphia. C. F. Stollmeyer, 1840, 12mo. pp. 480. — It was our intention to notice this work at length; but on examining it somewhat attentively, we find that it would require more time and space, than we can now command, to do anything like justice either to its author or to ourselves. We must therefore be content to give it for the present a mere passing notice, leaving a more extended review till such time as we may find ourselves more at leisure. The work is timely, and full of important principles and suggestions. It is a condensed summary of the scheme of M. C. Fourier for the reorganization of Industry, and cannot fail to be read with intense interest by all who are disposed to believe that the present system of industrial arrangement is susceptible of improvement. It is written in a calm, philanthropic, and yet earnest spirit, and does great credit both to the talents and the benevolence of its author.

We do not feel competent to give even the outlines of the scheme here proposed, and certainly not competent to sit in judgment on all its details. We may say, however, that the Author does not look for the melioration of the fate of the millions from mere political changes, that is, changes in the organization or administration of the State. The evils he sees lie deeper than forms of Government; they lie back of the state, and are so far from being effects of vicious forms of government, or mal-administrations, that they are themselves the cause of all that is faulty or vicious in either. They are not political evils, but social. In denying that they are political, he does not fall into the quite common mistake of considering them individual, and therefore capable of being removed by individual exertions alone. He distinguishes between politics and what we suppose we may term socialism. Politics relate solely to the State. But the State is not

Society. The state is the government; in a monarchy it is the monarch; in an aristocracy it is the privileged few; in a democracy, taking the etymology of the word for our authority, it is the common people, or simply the people, as distinguished from the nobility. Whatever relates to the organization of the state, the distribution of its powers, and the discharge of its functions, belongs to the department of politics. Society lies back of the state, and is its creator and sovereign. The state is the mere agent of society, and will always be what the will of society ordains. If society be right, if its institutions be founded in justice, the state will be just and beneficent; if society be wrong, founded on false principles, and sustained by unequal, and therefore unjust, institutions, it is in vain, that you seek to reform your government, or perfect its administration.

It follows from this, that the concern of the Reformer is not with politics, but with society; and his aim should be to reform the institutions on which society rests.

Now, aside from our social instincts, the basis of society is Industry, expressed in the institution of Property. The character of society will correspond to the distribution of property, and the distribution of property must correspond to the organization of industry. Consequently, in order to effect any given social reform, you must strike at the existing organization of industry. When this organization is in harmony with the laws of human nature and the material world, society will present to man free and full scope for the harmonious development of all his faculties, and enable him to attain to what thus far he has fruitlessly sought — happiness, individual and social.

Our present organization of industry is vicious in the extreme. It is carried on in solitude, at great wastefulness, without anything to render it attractive, cheering, enlivening. It is incoherent. Man does not act in harmony with man; there is no union, no concert, but competition, estrangement, antagonism, exhausting the strength of individuals without yielding them a supply for their wants. From this wretched, incoherent industry flow, as so many natural streams, all our evils.

These evils are vividly portrayed in the work before us, and the defects of the present industrial arrangements clearly and, so far as we are able to judge, correctly pointed out. But it leaves us not here. It proposes a remedy. This remedy is to be found in the substitution of associated industry, for individual, coherent for incoherent, and in rendering labor attractive, so that man will feel the same passion for it that sportsmen do for the pleasures of the chase. The main body of the work is taken up with details of the plan of association, and of the methods by which this passionate fondness for labor may be created. Into these details we cannot enter, but must refer our readers to the book itself. Setting aside the details, of which we are not prepared to judge, we have no hesitancy in expressing our entire sympathy with the fundamental principles of the work, especially since in demanding associated labor, it by no means sacrifices individual property. It recognises both individual property

and communal property, and seems to have hit upon very nearly the proper limits of each.

We are pleased to learn that some friends of Mr. Brisbane's views, have commenced in Buffalo, N. Y., a journal devoted to their defence, called the *Phalanx*, and still more pleased to hear that Mr. Brisbane himself either has started, or is about to start, a journal in the city of New-York, designed expressly to give the public information concerning his system, and to urge its adoption. We assure him that we shall rejoice in his success, and cannot but augur good from the attempt, however it may terminate.

Woman and her Master. By Lady Morgan. Philadelphia. Cary and Hart. 2 Vols. 12mo. — These are two very sprightly volumes, and we have read them with pleasure. They contain much interesting matter, and manifest no little insight into the true significance of several dark passages in ancient history. They are characterized by a tone of commendable freedom and independence. Lady Morgan is rarely deterred from seeing the truth or telling it, by fear of the bigoted or the superstitious. Her remarks on the contest in which Saul was engaged with the priests, and which terminated in his overthrow, and the accession to the crown by David, the son of Jesse, are worthy the attention of modern divines themselves.

Lady Morgan deserves no little credit for the able manner in which she has vindicated the moral and intellectual claims of her sex. She has undertaken, and thus far successfully prosecuted, a work which has long been needed, and which will not be without results. Her views are in general just, and her arguments weighty, if not always conclusive; but in one respect, in her zeal for the rights and dignity of woman, she seems to us to carry the matter a little too far. We cannot agree with her that woman has always proved herself man's superior, in all except mere brute force. We admit readily her equality, but we are as incapable of yielding her the supremacy as we should be of claiming it for ourselves. Woman should be satisfied with the frank admission of her equality, and not risk that by laying claim to superiority. We do not, however, like this drawing of comparisons where none are admissible. The two sexes are equal but different. In some qualities, moral and intellectual, man has the advantage; woman has the advantage in others. Neither alone possesses in their fulness all the moral and intellectual qualities of human nature. One is the complement of the other; and in order to obtain the full "orbed" being, the two must be united. As to the superiority of the one, or the inferiority of the other, nothing need be said, except that one is not the other, and would gain or lose nothing by being the other.

As a general rule, spontaneity predominates in woman, reflection in man. In sudden inspirations woman is the superior; in what requires long watching, wearisome study, painful analysis, and calm reflection, man is superior. In regard to the virtues, woman unquestionably excels in some respects, and man in others; but that the balance upon the whole is unequal between them, we are not disposed to believe. In these days of fierce contention for woman's

rights, it has become almost necessary to stand on our defence, and assert man's rights. Men are not all devils, nor are women all angels. Man sometimes abuses his superior physical strength, but woman rarely fails to find her revenge. If she is sometimes his victim, he is sometimes hers; and her power over him probably is as great, and as often abused, as his over her. He sometimes leaves her to pine in mute sorrow, and he is sometimes driven into vice because she, the angel wife, fails to make his home a paradise. When we are young we may say pretty things, and be gallant at the expense of truth. We are just silly enough to do so, and have just little enough respect for woman, to dream that in this way we shall best please her fancy, and win the way to her heart. But a different language becomes us as we grow older. God made man in his own image; male and female made he them. We should always regard the two as constituting but one being. It takes them both to realize the Divine Archetype of Man. We should therefore never seek to exalt one at the expense of the other. They are the two halves of one whole, and equally necessary one to the other.

That woman has not held, and does not yet hold, her true rank in civil society, we are not disposed to deny. Man has made himself her master, and by so doing has become her slave. The consequences of this are bad to both. We would abolish all idea of mastership in the case. Man should not call himself woman's lord, that she may have the power through his affections or his lusts to lead him as she pleases. Hitherto woman has had no acknowledged right of interference in the affairs of the world. Her appropriate sphere has been held to be subordinate; and her duty that of obeying the will and pleasure of man. Our social and political institutions are exclusively masculine, and bear on their face the incompleteness which always must be looked for in that which is the product of one sex alone. We have erred in regarding man alone as a social element. The element of society is man indeed, but man as in the original creation, male and female. When man and woman in mystic union shall be regarded as the element of society, our political and social institutions will be neither incomplete nor barren, but they will be the full expression of the complete human being, and therefore adequate to all the wants of human nature.

In the great struggle for social equality which is coming on, woman is destined to play an important part. She is as much interested in this struggle as man. She may not be required to go into the political arena, may neither attend the polls, nor claim a seat in the legislative hall, but she must lend to the cause of social progress her powerful instincts, her sublime inspirations, and her generous sympathies. She must exalt the sentiments, purify the affections, and nerve the souls of the sterner, but more calculating, and therefore the more timid sex. Man is keener-sighted than woman, more disposed to look around, before and after, and more capable of appreciating the obstacles there may be to encounter in the prosecution of a grand undertaking. In this clearness of vision lies his weakness, the source of his hesitation to engage with all his soul; the reason why he so seldom attempts to realize what his heart craves, and his rea-

son approves. Woman sees by a sudden inspiration the end to be gained, and overlooks all intermediate difficulties, which is a great advantage. She pauses not at obstacles, and heeds not dangers, or death. She is, when inspired with a noble idea, the very soul of heroism, and capable of imparting it to man. In the great work which is still to be done for the human race, there is much to dare and to suffer, from which calculating prudence recoils. Woman's office is to come to our rescue, rally the retreating, and breathe into man's soul a more generous confidence, a spirit of nobler daring, to exalt his courage, and make him as it were blind by the omnipotence of the sentiment that moves him, and the brilliancy of the end to be gained. Every man who would acheive a noble victory for humanity, must have a sort of recklessness, at which the wise and prudent shake their heads. It is only woman that can give us this sublime recklessness, raise us above our calculations, and make us feel that the highest prudence is to wed ourselves to the noble cause, and live for it, or die for it, as the chances may turn out. Woman's influence is not indeed that of the wise and cautious commander, but that of the inspired bard, whose songs and odes thrill through the souls of the commonest soldiers, and make the meanest a hero.

History of the United States from the Discovery of the American Continent. By George Bancroft. Vol. III. Boston: Little & Brown. 1840. 8vo. pp. 463.—We shall not be guilty of the impertinence of praising this work by one of our most distinguished scholars. The public has passed sentence on it, and its rapid sales declare with sufficient distinctness the nature of that sentence, which, to say the least, is not one of condemnation. The volume before us brings the History down to the middle of the eighteenth century, and completes the History of the Colonization of the United States. Its execution fully sustains, and in some respects more than sustains, the high reputation acquired by the previous volumes. It surpasses them in simplicity of style, and in the composure and gravity of its tone; and proves to us that the author's political labors have served to mature and not to distract his powers. We hope the author will proceed in his labors, and commence immediately the History of the Revolution, which, on many accounts must be a superior work to this of the Colonization. The public will not suffer him to discontinue his work till he has brought it down to the latest period. In conclusion we must be permitted to congratulate the author on his success, and the country, that she has already found one of her sons, able to erect a lasting monument to her genius.

The Dial. A Magazine for Literature, Philosophy, and Religion. To be continued Quarterly. Nos. I. and II. Boston: Weeks, Jordan & Co. 1840. — This Magazine, which was commenced last July, has already acquired a reputation; and it promises to exert no inconsiderable influence on the thought and literature of this country. It may be regarded, we suppose, as the organ of the Transcendentalists, or exquisites of the movement party, — radicals indeed, of a most ultra stamp, but nevertheless radicals, who would *radicalize* in

kid gloves and sattin slippers. The Dialists belong to the genus *cullotic*, and have no fellowship with your vulgar *sans-cullottes.*

The opening address of the editors to their readers is unnecessarily offensive. The prophet Elijah once took it into his head that of all God's prophets he alone was left: but the Lord rebuked him, and told him that he had, even in Israel, reserved seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal. It is foolish to affect to ignore all excellence but one's own. True greatness is always able and willing to recognise merit even in the lowly and obscure.

The Dial contains pieces in prose and verse, and in general inserts its poetry in its prose, and its prose in its rhymes. Some of its prose pieces are more poetical, than most of its pieces in verse. There is a magic of poetry that hovers over the essay on Modern Literature in the second number, which proves the writer deserves to rank high among the inspired. "The Problem," however, in the first number, is not merely verse, it is poetry, and unsurpassed, if equalled, by any production of the American muse, with which we are acquainted. "Wood Notes," in the second number, apparently by the same author, are passable, but they fall far short of the sweet, wild, sad music, every true lover of nature hears whenever he walks the woods. For ourselves we have no patience with the poetry that babbles of flowers, woods, rivers, and other external objects. The poet rarely reproduces what we have felt when left alone with nature. We feel her beauty, yield to her influence, without breaking out, "How beautiful!" or attempting to depict the objects from which the spell that is upon us proceeds. We love Nature too well to read the poet's description, and her wild notes are ringing too distinctly, too sweetly in our ears, to permit us to be pleased with any attempts to imitate them. Nevertheless, this criticism does not exactly apply to these "Wood Notes," which are better than most notes of the kind.

The criticisms on painting and statuary scattered through these numbers make some pretensions, but they seem to have been derived from reading, rather than from observation.

Of this Magazine, we may say in general, it is a truly remarkable work. It is full of rich thought, though somewhat injured by its puerile conceits, and childish expressions. Its thought is in general superior to its expression. Its authors seem to have caught some partial glimpses, and to have felt the movings of a richer, a higher life, which carries them away, and which as yet they have not been able to master. To our taste they want robustness, manliness, and practical aims. They are too vague, evanescent, aerial; but nevertheless, there is a "sad sincerity" about many of them; and one cannot help feeling, that these after all are the men and women who are to shape our future. On many sides they expose themselves to ridicule, but at bottom, there is a serious, solemn purpose, of which even they are but half conscious. Though we often find them too ultra for our belief, and sometimes too finical for our taste, yet we view their movements with deep interest, and hope from their labors, much to lead to a new and a higher life for the individual, and for the world.

Grandfather's Chair: A History for Youth. By NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE; Author of Twice-Told Tales. Boston: E. P. Peabody. 1841. — This is a delightful little book, the production of true genius, and which will fetch a response alike from youth and age, from the unlettered and the learned. We assure Mr. Hawthorne that we thank him both for our own and our children's sake for appearing again in print; and would beg him to proceed with all reasonable despatch in the wonderfeul and touching adventures of GRANDFATHER'S CHAIR. He will find us in the attitude to listen, or if not, he will soon compel us to listen.

Emancipation: By WM. E. CHANNING. Boston. E. P. Peabody. 1840. 12mo. pp. 111. — We have no space to enter into a discussion of the important subject treated in this little work, and no production by Dr. Channing needs any commendation from us to secure it the attention it deserves. The work treats mainly on the working of Emancipation in the West Indies, and proves what we have often asserted, that the system of wages is a much more successful method for the *exploitation* of man by man than slavery itself. We cannot, however, forbear expressing our astonishment that the following passage could ever have fallen from the pen of so accurate an observer, and so truth-loving a writer as Dr. Channing. "*It is with deep sorrow, that I am compelled to turn to the contrast between religion in England and religion in America. There it vindicates the cause of the oppressed. Here it rivets the chain and hardens the heart of the oppressor.*" Does Dr. Channing believe this? Does religion in England plead the cause of the poor Irish, where out of a population of about Eight Millions, every third person experiences a deficiency of even third rate potatoes for thirty weeks in a year? Does it plead the cause of some Eleven Millions of wretched proletaries in England and Wales, a large portion of whom are in a condition almost infinitely below that of the Negro slave? Does it vindicate the cause of the oppressed Millions in India, victims of the avarice and tyranny of her East India Company? To talk of *English* religion vindicating the cause of the oppressed, betrays an ignorance almost inexcusable. England is at this moment the grand enemy of Humanity, the enslaver of the nations, and arch oppressor of the laborer, and when has her religion rebuked her?

Nor was it religion that emancipated the slaves in the West Indies. If the East India Company had said nay, or had not desired it for their own interest, the religion of England might have screamed herself hoarse over the suffering slave, without having loosened a single fetter. England is the corruptest nation on earth, and her religion is of a piece with her general character. When her religion commands her to free her slaves at home, to show a disposition even to attempt to repair in the slightest degree the wrongs, she has for seven hundred years inflicted on unhappy Ireland, to do something to mitigate the wretchedness of her operatives, besides shooting down or imprisoning the poor Chartists, we will listen to eulogiums on the religion of England; but till then we call down upon her the indignation of a just God, and the curses, deep, burning,

blasting curses of the oppressed everywhere. We assure Dr. Channing that it is with deep sorrow that we have found him, the pure-minded friend of religion, the warm-hearted defender of the rights of the oppressed everywhere, holding up England, or the religion of England, in favorable contrast to his own country. This is to stab Liberty in the house of her friends. It is to do what one can do to place the religion and philanthropy of this country at the service of the worshippers of mammon, and make Christ do homage to the devil.

The Rhode Island Book: Selections in Prose and Verse, from the Writings of Rhode-Island Citizens. By ANNE C. LYNCH. Providence: H. Fuller. 1841. 12mo. pp. 352. — We received this book at too late a moment to be able to notice it as it deserves. We can only say that, from a slight glance at the pages, we have satisfied ourselves that Miss Lynch has acquitted herself of a difficult task with great delicacy and judgment. Her selections appear to be made with great fairness, and indicate on the part of the editor a commendable liberality of sentiment and correctness of taste. We meet here the names of many of our friends, of not a few of our old acquaintances, and one especially, Mr. Green, the author of "Old Grimes," whom we have admired ever since we could remember. The book gives us a favorable impression of Rhode-Island Literature, notwithstanding the impossibility of anything like justice being done to it, in a volume of mere selections. As a book, however, it is much more readable, and altogether of a higher order, than the Boston Book, for this or any other year. We commend it to our readers as an agreeable, interesting, and upon the whole instructive volume of miscellanies, well deserving place on the centre table.

We have little space for extracts, but we cannot resist the temptation of subjoining the following by the Editor.

PAUL PREACHING AT ATHENS.

SUGGESTED BY THE CARTOON OF RAFFAELLE.

Greece! hear that joyful sound,
A stranger's voice upon thy sacred hill,
Whose tones shall bid the slumbering nations round,
Wake with convulsive thrill.
Athenians! gather there, he brings you words,
Brighter than all your boasted lore affords.

He brings you news of One
Above Olympian Jove. One in whose light
Your gods shall fade like stars before the sun.
On your bewildered night,
That UNKNOWN GOD, of whom ye darkly dream,
In all his burning radiance shall beam.

Behold, he bids you rise
From your dark worship round that idol shrine,
He points to him who reared your starry skies,
And bade your Phœbus shine.
Lift up your souls from where in dust ye bow,
That God of gods commands your homage now.

But brighter tidings still!
He tells of one whose precious blood was spilt
In lavish streams upon Judea's hill,
A ransom for your guilt, —
Who triumphed o'er the grave, and broke its chain;
Who conquered Death and Hell, and rose again.

Sages of Greece! come near —
Spirits of daring thought and giant mould.
Ye questioners of time and nature, hear
Mysteries before untold!
Immortal life revealed! light for which ye
Have tasked in vain your proud philosophy.

Searchers for some first cause!
Midst doubt and darkness — lo! he points to One,
Where all your vaunted reason lost must pause,
And faint to think upon;
That was from everlasting, that shall be
To everlasting still, eternally.

Ye followers of him
Who deemed his soul a spark of Deity!
Your fancies fade, — your master's dreams grow dim
To this reality.
Stoic! unbend that brow, drink in that sound!
Skeptic! dispel those doubts, the Truth is found.

Greece! though thy sculptured walls
Have with thy triumphs and thy glories rung,
And through thy temples and thy pillared halls
Immortal poets sung, —
No sound like these have rent your startled air,
They open realms of light and bid you enter there.

Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit. By S. T. Coleridge. Edited from the Author's Manuscript. By Henry Nelson Coleridge. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1841. 12mo. pp. 129. — This is a somewhat interesting little work, by a man who thought much, talked well, and wrote too little. It consists of seven letters to a friend, never before published, "concerning the bounds between the right and the superstitious view and estimation of the Sacred Canon, in which the writer submissively discloses his own private judgment on the following questions.

"I. Is it necessary or expedient to insist on the belief of the divine origin and authority of all, and every part of the canonical books as the condition, or first principle of Christian faith?"

"II. Or may not the due appreciation of the Scriptures collectively be more safely relied on as the result and consequence of the belief in Christ; the gradual increase, in respect of particular passages, of our spiritual discernment of their truth and authority, supplying a test and measure of our own growth and progress as individual believers, without the servile fear that prevents or overclouds the free honor which cometh from love? 1 John iv. 18."

To the first question Mr. Coleridge answers in the negative, and therefore denies the doctrine of plenary inspiration; to the second he answers in the affirmative, and therefore makes the Christian's experience the test and measure of the truth and authority of the Scriptures. His doctrine on the Bible is virtually the doctrine which we ourselves have long entertained, and frequently set forth. It is therefore with pleasure that we welcome the publication of these "Confessions." To the numerous admirers of Coleridge in this country, they will need no commendation. To those among us, — and they are many, — who worship the mere letter, it will be a useful present.

Airs of Palestine, and other Poems. By John Pierpont. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1840. 12mo. pp. 334. — We are hardly pardonable for not having noticed these poems sooner, and we regret that we can only notice their publication now. We can merely add that this volume presents quite a variety, both as to the kind and the quality of its contents. Many of the *Devotional* pieces will be found suitable for the expression of pious feeling, and worthy to rank beside the productions of Watts and Doddridge. The *Airs of Palestine*, the longest poem in the collection, is generally smooth and musical in its versification, and some portions of it are in a high degree poetical. Of the *Occasional* pieces, those in praise of cold water, and in vindication of the right of petition, are the best. Mr. Pierpont is no sentimentalist, no transcendentalist, but he has a free, bold mind, strong and generous impulses, much genuine feeling, and an eye for the picturesque and the beautiful in nature, many of the characteristic qualities of a true poet, and the volume before us is highly creditable to his industry, his genius, and above all to his moral and religious principles.

Essay on the Character and Influence of Washington in the Revolution of the United States of America. By M. Guizot. Translated from the French. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1840. 16mo. pp. 188. — This, like every thing from the pen of M. Guizot, at present the able Minister of Foreign Affairs in the French Cabinet, possesses no ordinary value. It is in general a very fair and a very just estimate of the character of Washington. It errs, however, we think, by overrating Washington's influence in our Revolution. No man was, or could be, under the circumstances, better fitted to conduct the armies of the Republic, and no man ever proved himself more faithful to his trust. Still, he did not make the Revolution, nor was he the Deliverer or Saviour of his country. The American Revolution was the work of no one man, but of the American people. The American people declared and achieved their independence, and to them, not to any chief, not even to Washington, belongs, under God, the glory. In no country in the world are mere individuals, however great, of so little importance as in ours. We have a great people, and therefore are never at the mercy of great chiefs.

THE

BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1841.

Art. I. — *Conversations with a Radical.* By a Conservative.

CONVERSATION V.

R. That was an ingenious argument with which you closed our conversation yesterday.

C. It must have shaken your theory a little.

R. Perhaps so. And yet it was not quite satisfactory. Every man, of course, should draw according to his investment; but since all men are born equal, will you be so good as to inform me how it happens, that one man, on commencing in life, is able to make a larger investment than another?

C. All men may perhaps be born with equal rights, but they are born with very unequal capacities.

R. And one's superior natural capacity consists in his having houses and lands, shops and tools, sheep and cattle, ships and merchandise to invest, while another has only his bodily activity?

C. I do not comprehend you.

R. You claimed in our conversation yesterday, the right to a larger proportion of the income of the copartnership existing between you and your hired man, on the ground that your investment was greater than

his. I ask, how you were able to make this greater investment, and you virtually answer, that it is owing to the fact, that you were born with a capacity superior to his. Does this superior capacity of yours consist in the possession of more capital than he has?

C. My capacity is purely personal, and has no relation to my external possessions. But having this superior natural capacity, I have been able to accumulate more than he, and am therefore able now to make larger investments than he can.

R. You assume then, that the differences one sees in wealth among men, are all owing to the differences the Creator establishes in their natural capacities?

C. Certainly.

R. And since the Deity must have willed these different capacities, or he would not have suffered them, and since inequality in wealth follows as a necessary consequence of inequality of capacity, you infer that it is the will of Providence that some should be rich, and others poor?

C. Precisely. And therefore I contend that in seeking to bring about equality as to men's possessions, you are warring against God.

R. Some men I believe inherit wealth. These inherit, I suppose, because they are born with a superior natural capacity. The son of a rich man, then, has always a larger natural capacity than the son of a poor man?

C. I do not say that. Most of our rich men were poor men's sons.

R. And yet you tell me that all the differences, which exist among men in regard to wealth, are the necessary result of their different capacities. If you are right in this, it follows as a matter of course, that the children of the rich, who become rich by inheritance, inherit not because they are the children of the rich, but because they are born with superior natural capacities.

C. I claim no natural superiority of capacity for the children of the rich over the children of the poor.

R. Then I suppose you will modify your statement a little, and admit that those differences, which are introduced by the principle of inheritance, are exceptions to your general rule, and are not in fact the result of unequal capacities?

C. Very well.

R. I am aware that the differences introduced by the principle of inheritance are not all the differences or inequalities which do exist in regard to wealth; but still they form directly or indirectly no small portion of them. Now will you tell me on what principle you legitimate the right of inheritance?

C. What! would you deprive me of my right to leave what little I may have saved from my hard earnings to my children? What! would you rob my children of their right to inherit the estate of their father?

R. Nobody, my dear Sir, has any wish to deprive you or your children of any right which nature or nature's God may have given you or them. I am not among those who would do evil that good may come, or who would seek good at the sacrifice of right. Be just though the heavens fall, is my motto. Prove that what you call your right. is your right, and I certainly will respect it.

C. Have I not a right to do as I will with mine own?

R. No, Sir; you have no right to use your property to injure your neighbor, your country, or your fellow-men anywhere; you have no right to use it for the production of a smaller good, when it is in your power to use it for the production of a larger. You are bound to be good, and to do good, and not only to be good a little, but in the highest degree possible; not only to do a little good, but the greatest amount of good possible. You see, Sir, that what you call yours, is by no means yours. You are in relation to all you call yours, but God's steward, and are bound in morals and in religion to use it as he commands, that is to say, in obedience to the commands of justice and love; and

society has the right to force you to use it so. So it does not necessarily follow that you have the right to leave your estate to your children.

C. But my children have a right to inherit my estate. This is a right universally acknowledged, and sanctioned by the practice of every age and nation.

R. A right universally *denied* and sanctioned by the practice of *no* age or nation. The right of the father to disinherit, so far as my information extends, unless the Code de Napoleon furnish an exception, is universally admitted; and the right to disinherit negatives the right to inherit.

C. But the hereditary transmission of property is a wise and judicious disposition of it.

R. Are you sure of that?

C. What is more natural or reasonable than that I should leave my property to my children whom I have loved, and whose welfare is dear to me? or what is more natural or reasonable, than that my children should remain where they were born, amid the scenes of their earliest recollection, and enjoy what they had themselves assisted in accumulating? The hope of leaving something to our children stimulates our exertions, and the desire to labor for the welfare of our children purifies our affections, and makes us greater, wiser, and better. It is this which keeps society together. Take away the need of laboring for the welfare of our children, and their dependence on us for their support, and the family bond is broken, isolation is introduced, and the very elements of society annihilated. Sir, the wildest and wickedest scheme devisable is that of the abolition of hereditary property.

R. I have not proposed to abolish it; I have merely asked you to show the justice of those inequalities in our social condition, which are produced by the hereditary transmission of property. But let this pass. I am not so confident as you seem to be, that the hereditary transmission of property is an advantage even to the children of the rich; nor am I by any means satisfied, that that portion of industry which is stimulated by

the wish to leave an estate to one's children is at all desirable. I have heard rich men say, that they considered it a very great misfortune for children to inherit a large property, and my own observation tends to prove that they are right. They who inherit a large property are rarely valuable members of the community. Moreover, children who are brought up in the expectation of wealth, of inheriting a fortune, rarely acquire moral and virtuous habits. They may have a blandness and grace of manners, fine taste in dress and equipage; but they have rarely the feelings of moral, accountable beings, who are placed here not for their own pleasure, but to be good and to do good; not unfrequently are they corrupted by indulgence, by their excesses, while still in early youth, and I have sometimes thought, that the rich father or mother might envy the poor widow the feelings with which she contemplated her naked, houseless, homeless, fatherless boy. These palaces of the rich, had they tongues, could tell us tales. These rich dresses, that we envy, conceal much.

Nor can I believe it desirable that a man should labor for the purpose of leaving a fortune to his children. While he is amassing the estate, in nine cases out of ten, his children are acquiring the habits which least of all fit them to use it. There was an old acquaintance of mine, Jack Turnpenny. Jack was a poor boy, brought up to the trade of a hatter, and worked some three or four years at hat-making after he was of age. But he had no inclination to go through life as a mere mechanic. He felt that he was made to be a rich man, and that to be a rich man he must go into trade. He shut up therefore his shop, disposed of his tools, paid up his debts, and found himself at the age of twenty-five, in possession of just twenty-five dollars in money. With this capital he commenced business; after a few years, he was able with a friend to establish himself in one of our Atlantic cities, and also a mercantile house in one of the Canadas. The world seemed to favor Jack;

he grew rich with great rapidity, and became a large importer from England, a wholesale dealer, a president of a bank, an alderman, an extensive manufacturer and woolgrower, and a heavy land-speculator. Thus was he when I first formed his acquaintance, some dozen years ago. He was a leading man in public affairs, a man of high standing, generally courted, and envied, and often pointed out as an instance of the extreme facility with which in our country a poor man may become rich. Jack heard me one day preaching my radicalism, and having, above all, known my father and been much indebted to him for his early start in the world, invited me to his house, and finally told me his story. He was now about sixty-five years of age, had been twice married, and had ten children, five by his first wife and five by his second. His eldest son, Frank, was a boy of bright promise, born with a high order of intellect, but his early education was neglected; his father was too busy to attend to it; and he fell early into dissipated habits; and though his father was liberal, his means were inadequate to his expenses. To help himself he broke into the strong box of an uncle, and escaped the penitentiary only because both father and uncle were rich and influential, and disposed to hush the matter up. The second son was established in business with a capital of forty thousand dollars in this very city where we now are. This capital he soon sunk twice over. His father recalled him, and obtained a situation for him in South America; but all to no purpose. He keeps him now at home, and regular by prohibiting all persons from trusting him, and by refusing him a single cent of money which he may himself control. His third child was a daughter, a sweet lovely girl,but she was married to a man she could neither love nor esteem, and with whom she would not live. His next two children were, one of them like the two eldest, a drunkard, and the other, having taken it into his head to be a preacher was externally decent. The rest were still young, but promising to follow in the footsteps of their seniors. "O,"

said he to me one day, "O, I have been a fool. If I had labored to train up my children in the way they should go, instead of laboring to leave them an establishment, I had not been desolate now in my old age, nor compelled to go down in sorrow to my grave. I have ruined my children, damned them for time and for eternity. O, I have been a fool, a fool." Poor Jack, poor man, most wretched father, thou wast but a type of what most of us are or would be. Thy story is less tragic than many that might be told. My heart clung to him, for he was miserable. He has gone to his long home now. His estate descended to his children, who have scattered it to the four winds, and who are, as you might expect, themselves, now little better than mere vagabonds. You, I presume, are a father; would you such a fate for your children?

C. Touch not that chord, I pray you. I *am* a father, and I too have a profligate son, but I hope to be able to reclaim him yet.

R. God forgive me, Sir; you too have grieved. Then there is brotherhood between us. May you be able to reclaim your son. But suppose you do, the end is not yet. There are few families in this country which retain wealth for many generations.

C. That I regard as one of the best features of our system, and proves that we can never have a large, overgrown, and overshadowing aristocracy. What one generation amasses the next disperses, so that the grandchildren of the rich man are generally the poor, while the grandchildren of the poor have their turn, and are the rich.

R. O, Sir, I begin to lose the respect for you that I felt a moment ago. Can your love descend no lower than your children? Have you no affection for your grandchildren? And is it not as great an evil for them to be left destitute, as for your children, their parents, to be so left? O, my brother, you are short-sighted and heartless. These poor grandchildren must not only endure their poverty, but their poverty must be deepened by knowing that their parents were once wealthy.

It is not the least of our evils in poverty, to feel that we are poor and wretched, through the vices, the folly, the extravagance of our fathers. I am one of those grandchildren. My mother's father was a man of great wealth, and so was my father's father. My mother had eight sisters, and if I may judge from what they were in my early youth, they were women of rare beauty and accomplishments. The eldest married young, a worthy mechanic, and was disowned by her family, but being left a widow in about a year, was received into favor again. She married some two years after, an only son of a wealthy merchant. The son, expecting his father's property, made no exertions of his own, but lived for some twenty years in virtual poverty, when his father died, and bequeathed his whole estate to a stranger. Thus he was at the age of forty-five, with a wife and six children, with habits of idleness, unfitted for any kind of business, and not worth a groat. He could not endure it, and disappeared, and we have never heard of him since, now some twenty-five years. Her second sister married a foreigner, who professed to be a gentleman, who had great expectations, which were never realized. She was a beautiful woman, and possessed of an uncommon intellect. She has been a maniac for this twenty years, and he died a sot a few years since. My mother was the third daughter, possessed of wit, beauty, and feeling. Hers was accounted a happy marriage. But she was left a widow at the age of twenty-six, with five children, of which I, the youngest, was but a few months old. My father had become bankrupt, and the portion which was our due from our maternal grandfather's estate was seized by an uncle, who, under the character of executor, suffered none of it ever to come to us. A maiden aunt, a sister of my father, left me a small property, which enabled me to acquire a little education, and for a time to assume a decent rank in society. But that I have long since expended in my efforts at reform. Another of my mother's sisters, the youngest, I visited a few years since. She too had mar-

ried the only son of a rich man; but I found her with a family of seven children, living in a miserable hut, with only one room not more than twelve feet square, in most squalid wretchedness. Her husband was doing nothing, would do nothing but wait for his father to die. The history of the rest is of a piece with what I have given. Of the nearly fourscore grandchildren of my mother's mother, now living, and whose history I know, not one is in the least benefited by the wealth to which their parents were born heirs. This, Sir, is merely a brief sketch of my own family. If you were to tax your memory, perhaps you might tell me as much.

C. I have no wish to make you my confidant. But is there not another class of grandchildren that have come up, whose story would be the opposite of yours?

R. Perhaps so; but what comfort is that to me and my cousins? Property shifts hands, I own; and there are constantly individuals rising and individuals going down; but alas, to go up is not happiness, and to go down is misery. This shifting of individuals, which seems to you so blessed a thing, serves but to augment the sum of the general misery. Every time that property is forced from the hands of one into those of another, there is untold suffering. We suffer if it is taken from us; and if we are those who take it, we suffer, if we are human, at the misery we occasion. No, do not talk to me of this system of compensations, which you conservatives applaud so much. Regarded as final, it but aggravates the wretchedness of the community. On this point I must read you an article which I find in one of the papers you handed me this morning. The first part of it bears on a point we discussed yesterday; the last part on the point now under consideration. It places the arguments you would use in a strong light.

"RICH AND POOR.*

"'Never was an error more pernicious than that of supposing that any separation could be practicable between the interests of the rich and the working classes. However selfish may be the disposition of the wealthy, they cannot benefit themselves without serving the laborer. Let the rich proprietor improve his land; let him build houses or ships; he must employ the poor; and while it is thus certain that the rich cannot serve themselves without serving the laborer, it is evident that whenever the rich are injured, the laborer must suffer. If the laboring classes are desirous of having the prosperity of the country restored, they must sanction all measures tending to reinstate our commercial credit, without which the wealthy will be impoverished, and the needy be rendered still more necessitous.'"—PROF. HARE.

"'One of the features which society has presented within the last few years, the most fearful in its aspect, and destined if unremoved to be most disastrous in its issue, is its contentions and animosities, its divisions into parties, where the dividing line has reference not to policy or principle, but condition, where the poor are arrayed against the rich, the mechanic against the merchant, the laborer with his hands against the laborer with his head. In a community like ours, where arbitrary distinctions are not admitted, where the *fluctuations of families is a necessary law of the system, where the poor of to-day are the rich of to-morrow, the laborer of to-day the capitalist of to-morrow, where few can go back more than a generation without coming to an ancestry, poor in wealth, however rich and honorable in virtue, and could they look forward as far, would see perhaps a posterity poor in both these respects*, it seems strange that, in such a community, such a division should have ever been suggested or cherished.'"—*Christian Examiner for July*, 1837.

"These two paragraphs, one from a Professor of Chemistry, we believe, in Philadelphia, the other from a grave Divine in our goodly city of Boston, may be taken by our readers as a demi-official statement of the views of the aristocracy concerning the points of social science therein touched upon. The truth of these views may not at first sight be perceptible to all readers; we must, therefore, be allowed to occupy some little space in elucidating and verifying them.

"The doctrine set forth in these paragraphs is, that the interests of the working classes and those of the rich are one and the same. This must be evident to all who are capable of seeing things as they are. We may show this by taking the instance of the horse and his rider. The interest of the rider is undoubtedly to ride. It is not for the interest of the horse, however, to be ridden, you may think; but you think so only because you are short-sighted, and see only the surface of things. The interest of the horse is a stable and provender. The stable and provender are in the possession of the

* Boston Reformer, July 21, 1837. O. A. BROWNSON, Editor.

rider, and the horse can obtain them only by yielding his mouth to the bit, and his back to the saddle, and by consenting to be ridden. If it be the interest of the horse to obtain a stable and provender, as it unquestionably is, then it is the interest of the horse to be ridden; and as it is the interest of the rider to ride, it follows irresistibly, that the interest of the horse and that of the rider are one and the same.

"Now the interest of the working classes is to obtain what corresponds to stables and provender for horses. But these stables and provender are in the *possession of the rich*, and can be obtained only by working *for* the rich. If, then, it be the interest of the working classes to have stables and provender, as it unquestionably is, then it is the interest of the working classes to work for the rich. The interest of the rich is of course to have the working classes work for them; consequently it is as clear as any demonstration in Euclid, that the interests of the rich and those of the working classes are identical.

"Now is disclosed the wonderful insight into the workings and nature of things — of horses and laboring men — possessed by this scientific Professor and this grave Divine. The one must have carried into the study of political economy the searching analysis which belongs to his favorite science, and the other must have availed himself of the up-gushing, and spontaneous wisdom so peculiarly characteristic of Divines, in order to combine the universe into one sublime synthesis, in which all variety is swallowed up in unity, and all differences of things, all diversity between the horse and the rider, the jackass and his driver, cease to be perceptible. It is wonderful!

"'Society,' says the Examiner in continuation, 'is to be surveyed as a whole, and the parts are to be judged by their relation to the whole.' If society have a top, unless it be the bottomless pit we read of, it must have a bottom; if it have a right side it must have a left side; rich men, it must have poor men; the high, it must have the low; riders, then the ridden. How absurd for the bottom to claim to be the top, the left side to be the right side, the poor to be the rich, the low to be the high, the ridden to be riders, (the horse would look well riding the man) one part to be another! Here, Jack, carry me over that mudhole, so that I need not wet my feet or soil my finely polished boots. What, won't you? Do you say it is not for your interest to carry me on your back through the mud? Nonsense. You are merely a part of a beautiful and sublime whole. You can have no interest contrary to, or separate from, any other part. I am also a part of this same beautiful and sublime whole, and it is *my* interest that you take me on your back and carry me safely over this mud-hole, so that I shall not wet my feet or soil my finely polished boots. It being settled that this is for my interest, it follows as a matter of course that it is for yours. So no more words, but take me on your shoulders instantly, for I am in a hurry, and am beginning to grow cold. This reasoning must of course convince Jack unless he be a very dunce, as it must be admitted is the case with many people.

"Some plain folks might ask, how happens it that the rich own all the stables and provender in the world? and what's the need of their owning them all, so that the working classes can have none without laboring for the rich? But it is obvious that these questions are very impertinent; and besides, they may be answered, that if the rich had not all the stables and provender in the world, they would not be the rich, which is a manifest contradiction in terms. Should some ask, what need then of having rich men at all? let them be answered in turn, if there were no rich men, who would employ the working classes and give them stables and provender for their labor?

"If anybody should be so stupid as to allege that it is for the interest of the working classes to get as much stabling and provender for their labor as possible, and that it is for the interest of the rich to give as little as possible, and therefore infer that the interests of the two classes are necessarily hostile; they may be answered, that we have already proved that the interests of the two classes are one and the same, and the Professor thinks to maintain the contrary is the most pernicious error which can be entertained, and the Divine thinks nothing is more to be deprecated than such an error, and that the evils which flow from it are the greatest calamity that can befall a nation.

"Should some perverse minds still persist and maintain that the existence of the two classes, one rich and the other poor, is itself inconsistent with justice and republican institutions, that so long as the classes coexist in the same community they will be mutually hostile, and that instead of useless efforts to reconcile them we should do away with them, abolish the distinctions of class altogether, and thus have neither rich nor poor, the Divine is ready with his reply, the 'order of Providence makes great distinctions in individual condition.' The order of Providence makes the distinctions of rich and poor, and whoever would do away with these distinctions, wars against God. This reply must be satisfactory.

"If, however, there should be here and there a downright infidel, not having the fear of the clergy before his eyes, to arraign the justice of the Providence which ordains these distinctions, and which some are foolish enough to deplore, the sagacious Divine with a marvellous foresight, meets them with his 'System of Compensations'—a sublime system which, if he could make good his claims to it as originator, would secure him an immortality on earth hardly less desirable than that which awaits him in the world to come. This system may be illustrated in this way: Jack strikes Sam, Sam compensates himself by striking Dick; Dick by striking Jonathan, and Jonathan by kicking Obadiah, and thus on through the whole list of Christian names. It is a system which bears some resemblance to the old play in which every one is required to strike his next neighbor. It is possible, though we have no proof of the fact, that the Divine in question, may have been familiar with this play in his earlier life, and that he has taken the hint for his system from his reminiscences of it. Perhaps he may have taken a hint or two from his college recollections. Freshmen are usually (we are

told, for thank God, by good fortune we escaped going to college) kicked about by the classes above them very much as they please; but in a year the Freshman enters a higher class and can then kick those below him, in like manner as he had been kicked before.

"This is a beautiful and consoling system. The kickee of to-day may be the kickor of to-morrow. My children are poor and slighted by my neighbor Longpurse's children; but my parental affection may be perfectly satisfied by the prospect there is that my grandchildren will treat his grandchildren as his children now treat mine. My father was rich and I am poor; but this same Mr. Longpurse's father was poor and he is rich; so I ought to be consoled for my poverty, and to count it a great blessing to live in a community where 'the fluctuations of families is a necessary law of the system, where the poor of to-day may be the rich of to-morrow, where few can go back a generation without coming to an ancestry, poor in wealth, however rich and honorable in virtue, and could they look forward as far would see perhaps a posterity poor in both these respects.' What blessed things these same 'fluctuations in families' must be! They are almost equal to the principle of 'Rotation in Office.'

"We hope our readers will make themselves familiar with this doctrine of 'Compensations.' We assure them it is thought very favorably of by quite a number of the Boston clergy, and Boston aristocracy. We are inclined to the opinion that it is the reigning doctrine of the city; if so, it is orthodox of course. It probably will require some learned dogmatist and scriptural interpreters to make it square with the great doctrine of love which lies at the foundation of Christianity; but Christianity is rather old fashioned and somewhat *passé* in our Metropolis. The doctrine of Compensations bids fair, therefore, to be in vogue for sometime to come. They who are the kickors are well satisfied with it, and as the kickees are hoping every day to get into the class of kickors, they will not contend very strenuously against it. It would be hard to rise to a kickor and then have nobody to kick."

But to leave this part of the subject; I suppose you will admit, that our aim as parents should be the real good of our children. You and I both have children that we love, and that we would leave in the best possible condition when we are called from this world to another. You are rich. But are you sure that you will be able to leave your children rich? Or if you leave them rich, are you sure that they will continue so for any length of time? Or if they continue rich, are you sure that they will not abuse their riches, and prove themselves a curse to their generation? All

these are questions which must pass through your mind. How do you answer them?

C. I have not the surety you speak of. Man can be certain of nothing that is future. But I trust Providence, and hope for the best.

R. Trust in your wealth, you should say. He who trusts in Providence, fears not to do right lest evil come to him or his. But can you conceive of no greater surety which it is possible to have than that you now have? To be brought up with the expectation of wealth, and not to receive it, is a serious evil; to have had wealth, and to lose it, is also an evil of no small magnitude. Now to both of these evils, your children or their children, as the world goes, are exposed. Would it not be better that wealth, instead of descending as now, and causing this vast amount of evil, which we can but deplore, it should descend by such a law that all, on starting in life, would receive an equal portion, and none more nor less than an equal portion? Then none would be brought up to expect greater wealth than they would receive; consequently no expectations would be disappointed. None would fare worse than the rest; consequently your children would fare as well as the best, and what more have you a right to ask for them? None would be rich; none would be poor; none would have enough to live without moderate labor, and none would have so little as to be obliged to live but to labor, as is now the case with the immense majority of our race. It would seem that under such a state of things, a man might lie down in the grave without a fear for the children he leaves behind.

C. So you would introduce a dead level! what do you suppose would keep society in motion under such a state of things as you imagine?

R. Hunger, if you can conceive no higher, holier motive. Men will be obliged to labor or starve; and they will be willing to labor, for labor will be honorable, since all will labor; and pleasant, since it will be only what is needed for exercise.

C. Well, dream away, but for my part, I think your millennium would be but a "dull dunce."

R. You differ in opinion, I perceive, from the wise Agur, whose prayer we learned when we were children: "Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me; lest I be full and deny thee, and say, who is the Lord? Or lest I be poor, and steal, and take the name of my God in vain?" *

C. If you could abolish hereditary property, do you suppose that would cure all the ills of society?

R. By no means. It would, however, pave the way for curing many of them, and the greater part of those which now weigh the heaviest upon us.

CONVERSATION VI.

R. Bating the inequality in property traceable to the principle of inheritance, the inequalities we meet are fairly deducible, you think, from our unequal capacities?

C. Yes.

R. You told me the other day that you drew more than your hired man because you had made a larger investment; that you had invested houses and lands, shops and tools, &c., while he had invested only his bodily activity.

C. True.

R. And did you inherit these funds of production, as we may call them, which you have invested?

C. No. I was a poor boy, and have nothing now but what I have worked hard for.

R. Then on commencing in life, your investment of capital was no greater than your hired man's?

C. No.

R. Then originally you were entitled to no larger a proportion of the gains of the social firm than he?

C. Well.

---

* Proverbs xxx. 8, 9.

R. How comes it, then, if every member of society receives in exact proportion to his investment, as you allege, that you, beginning on a par with your hired man, are now able to invest so much more than he?

C. I have answered your question by suggesting the primitive inequality of man's capacities.

R. I am then to infer that you claim a natural capacity superior to that of your hired man?

C. Well.

R. And it is owing to this superior capacity of yours, that you are now richer than he? that you are wealthy and he poor?

C. Well, go on.

R. And have you really *produced* so much more than he? or have you merely used your superior capacity in the *accumulation* of wealth?

C. In the accumulation of wealth unquestionably.

R. Do you suppose that you were ever able to produce by your own labor more than your hired man?

C. Probably not. At any kind of labor, he has always been able to do as good a day's work as I.

R. Then in point of fact, you probably have performed during your life no more productive labor than he? If then he had received all that he produced, and you had received no more than you produced, you would have been no richer than he?

C. Go on.

R. This being so, to what end has served your superior capacity? Has it served any other end than to enable you to pocket the proceeds of other's producing?

C. But you forget that I have furnished the capital on which they have labored, and my share has been no more than capital ought to draw.

R. But, my dear Sir, I have been for sometime trying to ascertain how you came, *in the first instance*, by this capital to invest. You began poor you tell me; when and whence did you, who at first were entitled to no more than your hired man, obtain the capital on which you could set him at work? In

point of fact, did you ever begin to prosper, to do well, that is, to make money, till you began to obtain a premium on the labors of others?

C. Probably not.

R. The whole question comes then to this; your hired man has had merely the capacity to produce, and he remains poor; you have had what is called a business talent, that is, the capacity to transfer to your own pockets the proceeds of other's producing, and are rich.

C. Do you mean to insinuate that a man cannot become rich without robbing the laborer?

R. I mean to say, Sir, that no man can become rich by trade, when he could not by an equal amount of labor in the work of production, without robbing productive labor of its just reward. If the trader, starting with the same amount of capital with the ordinary laborer, can become rich, while the laborer working equally as intense, and for as long a time, must remain poor, productive labor does not receive what it is entitled to; for a man should receive no higher wages for making a bargain, or measuring tape, than the laborer for hoeing corn. But I am not disposed to continue this discussion to-day.

C. Why not?

R. Because were I to do it, I should say some harsh things, and disturb your digestion.

C. Well, and what then?

R. A disturbed digestion impairs the sweetness of one's temper, and renders him very disagreeable.

C. Have you a good digestion?

R. For the most part.

C. Other things than indigestion then make people disagreeable?

R. Not many, if any. I have known many a man praised for every virtue under heaven, who would have been counted a very devil, if anything had occurred to disturb his digestion.

C. Would you make a man's character depend on the state of his bowels?

R. I have just listened to a course of Graham Lectures, and I have resolved never to make up my opinion of a man's moral worth, till I have ascertained how he digests. Dive into the secrets of a man's digestion, if you would know the secret of his character. What noble schemes of philanthropy, what strong devotion, and what sweet temperedness shall not a fit of indigestion destroy! Wry actions as well as wry faces proceed from the gripes. You shall rise in the morning, break the heart of your wife, box the ears of your favorite boy, scold your most faithful servant, and wish your cook to the devil, and yet you shall be the best and kindest of husbands, the most indulgent of fathers, the most considerate of masters, and the easiest satisfied with the cook. Whence the contradiction? You supped on tripe or turtle-soup, and did not digest well. Your Alexanders, Cæsars, Napoleons, Byrons, Dantons, are men of a bad digestion, and the world is indebted to the irritation caused by their indigestion, for their famous exploits, whether good or ill, grand or pitiable. On the other hand your Shakspeares, Miltons, Goethes, Wordsworths, are men of a most excellent digestion.

C. And yourself? Shall I not place you among the indigesters?

R. That would be hardly just. And yet time was when my digestion was bad enough. Many is the time that I have been set down as an ill bred, snappish, passionate, ever-to-be-avoided fellow, simply because my bowels were not in a right state; and I can say with truth, that I have never in my life done aught to be ashamed of, save when my digestion had been disturbed. When I commenced my career, my health was poor, my stomach was out of order, and the gastric juice was not secreted; I was then melancholy by fits, sometimes a little crazy, but generally short and crusty; I was most of the time mad, mad with myself and mad with the world.

C. And have not got over your mad fit yet?

R. Surely I have not had much to cure me. The

world has treated me but scurvily, and of the people in it few are entitled to my gratitude. Still, I am not what I was. My digestion is better. The world is less dark, and I find now and then a sunny spot, and the clouds which obscure my heavens are less dense, and here and there break away, and show a little blue sky beyond. O, Sir, it is most wretched to travel over this fair creation in company with the horrors of indigestion. My coat is coarse and threadbare, and my purse is empty, but it was not always so with me, and that it is so now, I am not ashamed. Humanity is perhaps the richer for my poverty. In my younger days I was a traveller; but a traveller, suffering from a bad state of the bowels. I found nothing to please. In this country the climate was too hot or too dry, in that it was too wet or too cold; in some countries the roads, the coaches, the horses, the drivers, the taverns, the cooking; in others the language, the manners, the soil, the flocks, and herds, the mountains and valleys, the forests and pasture lands, the thunder and the lightning, displeased me. Everywhere I found cause to complain, for everywhere I carried that with me which created the world I saw; and worse than all, I was everywhere taken for an Englishman, a circumstance which has since led me to imagine that all English travellers have a most miserable digestion.

C. But I can hardly believe that your digestion has much improved.

R. Yes it has. I look forth on Nature with other eyes. This is a glorious world. Everywhere does my heart leap to behold the beauty which surrounds me. The flowers delight me, and I turn aside my foot that I may not bruise the humblest that springs up spontaneously in my path. The birds soothe me with their wild notes, and hours do I lie in the shade listening to their gladsome song. I love Nature, for all begins, ends, and is informed with Love.

C. You forget this when you talk of the rich, and represent them as riding or eating the poor.

R. No; I do not. I love all animate and inanimate

creation. All has a lesson and a charm. But I have a mission. I am called to espouse the cause of the laboring classes. I have studied their condition in this and other countries. My life is devoted to their service; for them I will live, and if need be die. My head is gray with my efforts in their behalf. I have grown old, though yet hardly a middle aged man, in seeking to elevate their condition. No matter; I devote myself to their interests without wrath or bitterness. It is not that I hate, or envy, or despise the more favored classes, that I proclaim myself the champion of the less favored; but because with the workingman is to-day the cause of Humanity. Humanity goes forward; through centuries it makes its way, overcomes one difficulty, surmounts one obstacle after another, gains one position and then another, and onward forever will it march towards its union with God. At other times its friends may have been called upon to contend for other specific objects. Humanity once required the Greeks to beat back the Persians at Marathon and Salamis, Alexander to overrun Asia, and mingle Western with Eastern civilization; at another, that the Socratic philosophy should be kept alive, that Judaism should be destroyed, Christianity installed, Rome overthrown, and the Barbarians of the North brought into the civilized family; at another, that Luther should defy the Pope, and philosophers vindicate the sovereignty of Reason, that kings should be decapitated, and nobility reduced to the rank of commoners; but now Humanity cries out for the elevation of the hand-workers, and that the *exploitation* of man by man shall cease. If then I speak for the hand-worker, it is because that he to-day is Humanity. His triumph is the triumph of the race. What Humanity will demand of her servants and friends to-morrow I know not. I only know what she demands to-day. I hear her voice, which is to me the voice of God, and I dare not hesitate. I must speak. I am full of words, and I must utter myself. But if I speak hot, scalding words, words which go to the quick, it is because none other

can do justice to myself, or to the work I am sent to perform. Grant that my words are exciting, that I provoke divisions, and set man against man, lead to a fierce, bloody, and protracted war, they proceed from love, they are full of love, and shall end in love, in love universal and perennial. But I speak in riddles to your understanding. You cannot comprehend me. To you I am a mass of contradictions which you cannot reconcile, a labyrinth of which you have not the thread, a riddle whose word is not given you. No matter. I cannot explain myself to you. A blind man cannot be made to comprehend colors. Men, good easy men of the world, are not they who can comprehend him of lofty purpose, solemn thought, and kindling enthusiasm, who feels himself called by an eternal voice to the achievement of a grand, a glorious mission. Ever must he be to them a contradiction and a puzzle.

C. Not at all. All the difficulty is removed by supposing the state of his digestion varies.

R. Right. That solves the mystery. Hence learn why I contend so earnestly for the improvement of the external condition of the laboring classes.

C. That you may support your digestion on something better, more substantial than cold potatoes and Graham bread, I suppose.

R. No. But because the state of a man's mind and heart depends very much on his digestion, and his digestion is intimately connected with his social position.

C. I am not prepared to admit that.

R. Say, then, merely that in this mode of being, the body, whether it be the whole body, the bowels, stomach, or brain, exerts a powerful influence over the mind. This everybody knows to be true. We also know that our external condition, our social position, outward circumstances affect the body, to a great degree determine its condition, and of course the kind of influence it must exert over the inner man. What I mean is, that physical circumstances do have an important influence in making up our character.

C. It is the man that makes the circumstances, and not the circumstances that make the man. The man who has any inborn nobleness of soul will rise superior to his external condition; he will make everything bend to the irresistible energy of his will. Besides, virtue consists in struggling with difficulties, and in rising superior to them, not in having them cleared from our path.

R. All this I understand. I shrink not from the struggle. I may have struggled as hard as most men. Do what we can and there will be the combat, and I admit that it is well that we all be inured to the camp. I have no hope of realizing in all its fairy features either the poet's dream of the golden age, or the saint's vision of paradise. Do the best we can, make all the improvements in our power, and earth will still bear a rugged aspect, a stern, forbidding brow; this world will always be a scene of trial, where the lesson To bear will never come amiss. But this is no reason why we should not remove as many obstacles as we can. There will always be difficulties enough, and nobody need fear that the time will come when there will be too little suffering. I have no fears of making the world so happy, so free from difficulties, that there will be no room for virtue. And besides, your definition of virtue, is only a definition of what is virtue under certain relations. Virtue consists in overcoming difficulties, only when difficulties exist. It is virtue to relieve suffering, but only when there is suffering. We must not suppose virtue becomes impossible when suffering ceases, for then what should we do in heaven? The saints would have no virtue. Virtue consists in the love and realization of goodness. The form in which it is to realize it necessarily varies with time and space, with circumstances. Virtue never changes its nature, but it varies its aspects and dress.

C. I understand nothing of all this.

R. I am sorry for that, but let it pass. We are here for improvement, for progress. We are here to be and to

do good, and it is our duty to modify, change, or remove altogether, those external circumstances which prevent us from being or doing good, which continually lead us into temptation and abandon us to evil Now, the inequality in men's external condition, in their social position, is the most fruitful source — I do not say of suffering, but — of evil, vice, sin, depravity, which is known. There are few things of which we complain that have not their origin in this same inequality.

C. That it holds out many temptations I admit, but moral force, religious principle, would prevent its doing any harm.

R. To talk to a man suffering all the horrors of indigestion, of moral force, of religious principle, were talking to the insane man, of reason. This inequality throws men into a state in which you cannot bring religious principle or moral force to bear upon them. Religious principle, moral force, must be in the man before it can govern him or aid him. You must cast out the devil before you can form Christ within. Christ and the devil will not cohabit together. You have tried the experiment. You have preached religion and morality for ages, exhorted to virtue by a million of tongues trained to all the arts of persuasion, and what have you achieved? According to your own reckoning, though mankind were totally depraved at first, they have been growing worse ever since. What is the use of preaching religion and morality to the rich voluptuary, sunk in his sensual pleasures, when he is but doing that which everybody desires to do, and would do if he could?

C. I hope you do not mean to treat religion and morality with disrespect, especially religion, for without that society could not exist.

R. Have no fears on that score. — Would to God that you and your caste treated religion and morality with one half the respect I do. If ye would but practise them, instead of extolling their utility in keeping the lower orders in submission, I should be

thankful. But man has a body as well as a soul, and though the soul is the most important, the bodily wants are first developed and should be first provided for. Give the beggar a supper before you preach him a sermon or read him a moral lecture, and a cloak before you lead him to church, if you wish to influence him. Take away the luxury of the rich, make them feel that they are no better, no more favored than the rest of the community, if you wish their real prayers to be different from his who stood and thanked God that he was not as other men.

C. You approach agrarianism now.

R. What then? Do you fancy that I am to be deterred from speaking the truth through fear of a bad name? There is no charm in names now to exorcise the spirit you dread. Men there are now who pass from words to things; — men there are too, who are not afraid to look Truth herself in the face, and to utter in a clear, distinct, and firm voice, her most startling words. Better beware of applying nicknames; — they sometimes become battle-cries. The wood on which you crucify the Reformer becomes the sign in which his successors shall conquer.

But, I am no agrarian, in the sense in which you use the term. Yet I am, as you well know, opposed to the present unequal distribution of wealth. Its consequences are most disastrous. It puffs up the rich with pride and the lust of the flesh, makes them false, hypocritical, atheistical; and it fills the poor with a sense of wrong, with envy, discontent, and useless longings; and I war against it, and will war againgt it, single-handed if I must, to the death, if need be. Sir, I am a follower of him, whose express mission it was to bring down the high, and bring up the low, — to level the mountain and fill up the valley, to make the crooked straight and the rough smooth and even.

C. What! have you the audacity to pretend that Jesus preached such levelling doctrines as you do?

R. Ay, have I. Jesus was a sublime Leveller. Ay, I repeat it, Jesus was a sublime, a God-commissioned

Leveller, and this is wherefore the common people heard him gladly, and the chief priests, the scribes, and pharisees, the aristocracy of his age and nation, crucified him between two thieves. Why do you turn pale? Did you fancy that you had Jesus on your side? Were you dreaming of entertaining him in your gorgeous palace, feasting him on your sumptuous diet, and lodging him on your bed of down? Poor man! the young child was not found in Herod's palace, nor in the mansions of the rich, but wrapped in swaddling clothes and lying in a manger; and the Son of Man, when on earth, hath not where to lay his head. I see you are moved. Not to such as you comes the kingdom of heaven; not to such as you is assurance given of being lodged at last by angels in Abraham's bosom; but of taking up your final abode in hell, with not one drop of water to cool your parched tongue. "Son, remember," — these are the words thou must hear, — "that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted and thou art tormented." Ay, rage, if you will, but there is no alternative. You must either forsake Jesus, whose name you have assumed merely to take away your reproach, or submit to his doctrine, and become the bold and unflinching advocate of equality.

C. I shall advocate no such disorganizing, demoralizing, and levelling doctrines, as these you are putting forth.

R. Then take your place with the rich man in hell! You will not? No; nor would the young man, who came to Jesus to learn what he should do to inherit eternal life; *for he had large possessions.* You are too rich to be a follower of Jesus.

C. You wrong me. I aim to follow him, and I desire nothing more than to obey his commands.

R. Then go and sell what you have, give it to the poor, and follow him. What! do you hesitate? *You* a Christian? Why, you have large possessions.

C. This is nonsense.

R. And did Jesus speak nonsense, when he said,

"How hardly shall they that have riches be saved? Verily I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven?"

C. Surely you do not understand that passage literally?

R. Ay, it comes a little too close, does it? We must call in the priest to explain it away, must we? False hypocrite, a moment ago you were chiding me for my supposed want of respect for religion, and were pluming yourself on your orthodoxy; but who is the Christian now? Who now asks that God's word may be explained away, so that it may not rebuke his ungodly practice? There is the written word, the word uttered by him who was the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and whom you *profess* to take as your master. Do you believe him? Do you obey him? No; you know you do not. But you acknowledge him for your master, you own yourself accountable to him; go then and settle your disobedience with him as best you may.

C. But, I ask again, do you understand the passage you have quoted literally?

R. I am not wise enough, Sir, to revise the language of the Holy Ghost; nor am I base enough to be willing to use any portion of the ingenuity I may possess, in smoothing away the reproof his language necessarily brings to those who worship mammon and not God, and who prefer earth to heaven, or if heaven, solely for the gold which lines its pavements. You have priests enough, trained to the work of adapting the words of God to the peculiar state of your conscience, who, in honeyed tones, can soothe it, and with right reverend unction, allay remorse, and make the respectable sinner dream that God will think twice before he damns a man of his rank and standing. I, Sir, am no hireling preacher; I receive no fat salary for preaching so as not to disturb your slumbers in your softly cushioned pew. Nor is it my vocation so to preach. You are a rich man. You have become rich by the labors

of others, by trade, by buying cheap and selling dear, that is, by cheating at both ends of the bargain; and Jesus tells you it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven, and I leave you to draw your own inferences.

C. But can no rich man go to heaven?

R. Not if Jesus speaks truth.

C. Still, I cannot believe that Jesus meant precisely what you infer he did.

R. I understand him to assert that it was impossible for a rich man to have that spirit of self-denial, self-sacrifice, without which he could not be his follower, or engage with him, in effecting that new order of things, which he came to introduce and establish on the earth, and which is called the kingdom or reign of God. And I assert, to-day, that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than it is for a rich man to engage with me, in my efforts to establish the reign of justice and equality. In these efforts I have not the rich for my coadjutors. They have large possessions, and turn away sorrowful.

C. Your digestion, I fear, is somewhat impaired to-day. You are illiberal, and altogether too censorious.

R. You rich men may call us laboring men, the rabble, the vulgar, the many-headed monster, the swinish multitude, the scum and offscourings of creation, and nobody cries out against your want of charity or good taste; but let one of us call you by your right names, tell you in plain, forcible words what you are, and forthwith your Christian feelings are outraged, we are thought to be exceedingly uncharitable, venomous, and — impolite. But I tell you, ye rich men, that while I scorn to feel the least bitterness towards you, as I would towards the worm at my feet, I regard you as worshippers of mammon, as servants of the devil, of whom a wise man will expect nothing, and over whom the good man must weep with bleeding heart.

C. Come, do not grow sentimental, my good fellow.

R. My good fellow! who gave you the right to *fellow* me? Am not I a man, as well as you? and am I less a man because my coat is coarser, and my hand harder? My good fellow! So you dare speak to me, because I advocate opinions not in good repute in the gay saloons of the rich and fashionable. But were I rich and popular, you would stand in awe of me, and feel that you were unworthy to unloose the latchet of my shoes.

C. Forgive me. I meant no offence.

R. *Meant* no offence! That is the greatest offence of all. Had you *felt* the respect I am entitled to, you could not inadvertently have said aught improper. The offence is not in your words, but in the feelings which prompt such words, or suffer you to use them.

C. Say no more. It is foolish for you to be angry at my thoughtlessness.

R. Angry at *you?* Poor worm of the dust, do not flatter yourself that you can provoke me to anger. I can be angry only at him who is my superior, or at least my equal, and my equal you are not.

C. At least not in your aristocratic feelings.

R. Sir, I own that if by aristocratic feelings you understand a strong sense of one's own individuality, personal rights and independence, I have them in no small abundance, and should despise myself if I had not. I am as proud perhaps in my poverty, as you are in your wealth. Of pride I complain not. Be proud, if you will, but be proud of what you *are*, and not of what you *have*. But if you *are* nothing to be proud of, do not fancy that such as I will respect your pride for what you *have*. I can look with as much contempt on you, as you can on me, and at the curl of my lip you shall feel as much as I at yours. Mine, Sir, in my estimation is not by any means the lower rank. I have not yet sunk so low as to esteem a little paltry pelf, which the moth may destroy, or the thief break through and steal, above true courage, nobleness of purpose, rectitude of heart, and the power to live, and suffer, and die for God and man. But all this is aside the mark.

You think rich men may be good men. I would I could think so too. I am willing to believe that few of them know what they are about, or are conscious of the iniquity of the system they uphold. Nor am I disposed to regard them in intention, touching the motives of their conduct, as at all worse than the rest of the community. There are few among us who would not be rich if they could, and by the very means adopted by those who do become rich. Yet, Sir, I hold that the possession of great wealth, the condition of the majority of mankind being what it is, is incompatible with Christianity.

Look over the world, Sir, behold the great mass of mankind, poor and ignorant, all directly or indirectly, laboring for a few capitalists. Their labors, in the case of each one of them, are far more intense and continued for a far longer time than the labors of the rich, and yet obtain they but the minimum of human subsistence, and not always that. They dwell in darkness, and sit in the region and shadow of death. Is their enlightenment and moral and physical elevation a prime motive with you? Are you thinking of doing them good when you are compassing sea and land to grow rich?

Look too at these millions of young immortals daily coming into the world, and coming into the world too to run the same hopeless career of their parents. These young beings are born with noble natures, with capacities for all the eloquence of feeling, the sublimities of thought, and the majesty of virtue, — of binding themselves by the sweet ties of love to their kind, and by gratitude and reverence to their Maker. Yet on them no star of science ever rises; no day of hope ever dawns; the infinity of their nature lies shrouded in night, and they grow up with low thoughts, base feelings, and grovelling propensities; with no eyes for the beauty which everywhere blooms around them, no ears for the sweet music which eternally rings out from all nature, and no heart for the bounty which is strewed on either hand, even to profusion. To them, nature

and nature's God, this rich and glorious universe, on which I could gaze eternally and find fresh delight, must lie forever colorless and obscure — a mere vacancy. For them there is on earth nothing but to delve to live, and to live but to delve. O, my brother! can you behold them born and dying, and ask for them nothing better? Was it for such a fate God created and sent them hither?

C. I should be very glad to see those children decently educated, and fitted for usefulness and happiness.

R. On you and such as you we depend for the means of educating them, and putting them in the way of attaining their glorious destiny. You have all the wealth of the world, and what do you do for these young immortals? What sacrifice do you make for them? Of what comfort, nay of what luxury you desire for yourself or family, have you ever deprived yourself, that you might benefit them?

You call yourself a Christian, and deem me censorious, uncharitable, venomous, when I tell you that you are no Christian. Now, Christianity is easy to come at. It commands us to love one another as Jesus loved us. We are to love the poorest, the meanest, the vilest of God's offspring, well enough, if need be, to die on the cross for them, as Jesus did for us. You are no Christian unless you love these laboring masses, these ignorant and wretched children, born to no inheritance but toil, ignorance, misery; unless you feel a craving for their welfare that will enable you, though rich, to become poor for their sakes, and though held in honor, to become of no repute, that you may breathe hope into their chilled hearts, and strength into their stiffened limbs, and life into their souls so long dead. You must feel such a longing for their moral, physical, and intellectual elevation, that you shall live but for them, and find your meat and drink only in securing their redemption. Is this the case with you? Is it your constant study, how you may benefit them; your constant, burning desire to dissipate the night that hangs over them, and usher them into the glorious

liberty of the sons of God? Why do I mock? You know that you have felt nothing of all this. You can live in luxury, tread on the rich carpets of Turkey, tinge the light of your halls by the purple silks of India, and feast your palates on the dainties culled from every clime, while at your next door, the poor mother, pale and emaciated, sits watching over her starving boy. You a Christian! you spending your thousands for your own gratification, steeped in selfishness, caring for the poor and needy only to use them for your own advantage, *you*, a Christian! *you* hope for heaven! God Almighty, why then didst thou make a hell, and threaten the sinner with eternal vengeance! If there be a being on earth infinitely removed from Christ, it is he who in this world of wailing and woe, listens to no calls but those of avarice; in this world of suffering, degraded Humanity, is intent only on growing rich; in this world of poverty and dependence, studies the condition of the poor and dependent only for the purpose of making them the instruments of increasing his own wealth and importance. And such are our rich men. Were you to find yourselves in the possession of wealth, if you had the spirit of Christ in you, how long would you continue rich? He, though rich, for our sakes became poor, and though entitled to reverence as a god, for our sakes made himself of no reputation. If you had his spirit, you would soon impoverish yourselves that you might enrich Humanity, and make yourselves of no reputation, that you might raise up the poor and needy. But you do not this. The rich never can do it and continue to be rich. The rich have not then the spirit of Christ. If they have not the spirit of Christ, then are they none of his; and if none of his, on what can they rest their hopes of acceptance with God?

I pass over now the means by which men become rich; I say nothing of the widows they despoil and the orphans they rob; I say nothing of the sweat and toil, the hunger and nakedness of the poor slave that

toils to feed their avarice; I say nothing of the wrongs of the poor sailor, who braves the tempest and the deep, and the fiercer tempests of man's passions, to bring you the rich stuffs out of which you coin your wealth; I pass over all this, and confine myself solely to the use you make of your wealth, when once it is accumulated. I charge you with using it for yourselves, when you should use it for Humanity. I charge you with selfishness. You amass wealth to gratify yourselves; you hold it to feed your own vanity; you spend it for your own pleasure; you have no love of your race; no deep, burning desire to redeem man. You are cold and heartless; as polished it may be, and as impenetrable as marble. You worship the Respectabilities. You may build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, but you leave the Son of Man, who comes to redeem his race, not a stone whereon to lay his head. You contemn the just and seek to impede the progress of the righteous; the man who loves his race you count your enemy, and the prophet of God a child of Satan. You take the name of Jesus on your lips, you build him costly houses, you pay liberally his professed ministers, you dress his altars in purple and scarlet, and with gold and silver, but your heart's incense you withhold. God is not in all your thoughts; your faces never look upward to heaven; your eyes are cast down to the earth, and your souls have become of the earth earthy. Man of wealth, worm of the dust, who fanciest thou art somebody, and deemest thou hast a right to look down as from heaven upon the poor and needy, the toil-worn and the weary, speed on thy way. Speed on thy way; trust in thy shining dust, in thy respectability and high standing, and commanding influence over thy brother clay; pass on unheedingly by the houseless and friendless, or cast them a penny to make their wretchedness more palpable; but know that for all this God shall bring thee to judgment. Ere thou art aware thy career shall be cut short, and thou shalt be ushered into the presence of thy Judge. There, poor and naked, must

thou stand in the full blaze of eternity, and be seen and judged as thou art. There thy wealth will stand thee in no stead; there will be none to applaud thee for thy sins, because the sins of a rich man, a man of property and standing; there thou wilt receive the contempt thou deservest for having lived for thyself alone, the derision thou meritest for having fancied that *thou* wast the centre of the universe, and that all things should conspire for *thy* good. Go. I can endure thy presence no longer.

CONVERSATION VII.

C. Are you aware of what you do, when you charge the vices of individual character to the inequalities of our social condition?

R. I charge to society what you probably charge to the individual. The depravities of individual character originate in the depravities of the social state much oftener than in the perversity of the individual will. I therefore seek to reform society as one of the means of reforming individuals.

C. You place the cart before the horse. You should seek to reform individuals as the means of reforming society.

R. That is, take the end in order to obtain the means. Society is not ultimate. Its improvement is never to be regarded as an ultimate good. The proper object, and the only proper object, of pursuit, is the perfection, or the perfecting, of human nature, in each and every individual. The perfection of society is useless after this perfection is once attained. Your notion, although a common one, is unsound. Society was made for man, not man for society. Man is paramount to society. Society is subordinate and subservient, or should be subservient, to man. It has no value aside from the aid it gives man in developing and perfecting his nature. That social state in which every individual has free and full scope for the harmonious development and play of all his faculties, is a perfect

social state. The present social state is imperfect because it does not give this free and full scope, and just so far and no farther than it does not give it.

C. But it is sheer folly to talk of a perfect state of society without perfect individuals.

R. And not the less so, to talk of perfect individuals in an imperfect social state. An imperfect state of society, can turn you out only imperfect characters.

C. Not so. Man is not dependent for his virtue on the state of society in which he lives. He can attain his growth under all circumstances, and prove himself worthy of himself, in spite of circumstances. The truly great and good man grows but the more luxuriantly, the more adverse his circumstances. All that which the world most dreads and pronounces the greatest of evils, he bends under him, moulds to his purposes, or converts into the means of enlarging his greatness or his goodness. No, Sir; virtue comes from within, not from without; and place it in what light you will, it is but the victory of the Inward over the Outward.

R. All this is very fine, very eloquent, and would be very true, if men only were good and great; but of what avail is it to him who is neither one nor the other? The question is not, what one in whom human nature is already largely and harmoniously developed may do; but how it is to be developed in all its energy and glory in those in whom it is now undeveloped, or but imperfectly developed. Give me the self-control, the energy of will, the moral force, of your man who masters all outward circumstances, and I too will bend all nature beneath me, and compel it to minister to my virtue; but in case I have not this self-control, this energy of will, and this moral force, how am I to get them? Here is the point which you wise men of the church and the world overlook. Certain it is, that a large proportion of mankind are deficient in this moral power, and yet you address them all as if they already had it. Their vice consists in their not having it; and yet you tell them to make use of it as the means of curing their vice!

C. You do not state the case correctly. All have it.

R. If all have it, all do not exercise it; if it be in them it is undeveloped. How shall it be developed?

C. Nothing tends more to develop it than these very evils of which you complain. God permits this to be a world of evil as well as of good, that the evil may be the means of calling forth our moral force and enlarging the sum of our virtue.

R. Theory is worthless when unsupported by experience. In some cases the sufferings of this world unquestionably improve the character of the sufferers; but not in all. In a large majority of cases they have a most deteriorating influence. Poverty, sickness, grief, misfortune, suffering of whatever name or nature, usually hardens the heart, blunts the sensibility, sours the temper, and makes the subject of it harsh, peevish, morose, and selfish.

C. It is people's own fault if it do have that effect. They do not make the right use of the afflictions which God sends them.

R. But does that remove the difficulty? Grant that it is their own fault, the question is varied, not answered. How shall we cure them of that fault? The insane man, were he only so considerate as to exercise his reason, would at once be rid of his insanity; but, unhappily, the inability to exercise his reason is his insanity. No doubt men would get along very well, were they only to make a right use of evil; but their inability to make a right use of evil is the greatest evil of all. How will you enable them to make a right use of evil?

C. They can do it if they will.

R. But suppose they do not will, how will you make them will? But is it quite certain, that if they do will, they will be able to perform? There are some limitations to this omnipotent will of ours, about which some folks take it into their heads to talk so much. A fit of indigestion, a mistake of your tailor in the cut of your coat, a blow on your head by an angry fellow,

shall suddenly bring to nought one of the finest omnipotent wills imaginable. You may will, but a stronger arm than yours may hold you back from the performance. The drunkard, sober to-day, resolves, with the whole energy of his soul, that he will never drink again; but he shall find the first gay fellow who invites him to a social glass able to upset his omnipotent will. You may throw away your tobacco-box, and swear in the very depth of your being that you will never taste the nauseous weed again, but two hours shall not elapse before you buy another and roll the sweet morsel in your mouth, say your omnipotent will what it may to the contrary. Alas, we are feeble omnipotents, when a little indigestion, a glass of toddy, or a chew of tobacco can make us forswear ourselves, change our firmest resolutions, and do precisely what we willed not to do! We are free to will; we may will as we please; but to do, to perform — that is quite another affair. There is a stern Necessity which, while it leaves To Will unfettered, binds To Do in a chain of adamant. We are bound, and struggle as we may, we cannot break our chains. We would do good, but evil is present with us; and the good that we would, we do not, and the evil that we would not, that we do. We have all felt the struggle between the freedom of the will and the necessity which controls our actions. Everywhere do we meet resistance; on every side are we hemmed in, and every moment, though rising to heaven in our wills, are we dragged down to hell in our deeds.

C. Where now is what you have said of man's greatness, his godlike nature and tendency? You seem to have a most wonderful facility in contradicting yourself.

R. So you may think; but the contradiction you remark exists not in my words, but in human nature. Man is at once great and small, wise and foolish, strong and feeble, a spirit and a clod of earth, a god and a devil. If you fix your eye on one side of him, you are struck with his weakness, his nothingness; if on

the other, you are equally struck with his greatness, his sublime faculties and godlike tendencies.

What I have just said of his weakness is true, too true, as our daily experience proves; but it is not the only truth, by no means the whole truth. Under certain relations the human will has great energy, and seems all-conquering and unconquerable. Yet the power, we then ascribe to the will, is more properly the power of Faith, which brings the will into harmony with the primordial laws of the universe, and strengthens it by all the forces of Nature. "If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed," said Jesus, "ye could say unto this mountain, be removed and planted in yonder sea, and it should obey you." I am far from being able to prescribe the limits of full, undoubting, unwavering faith. Faith is thaumaturgic in its nature, always a miracle-worker, and if we could only undertake with a calm and full confidence of success, I have little doubt but the meanest of us might work greater miracles than any recorded in history. "If ye believe," says Jesus, "ye shall do greater works than these."

There is something in this power of faith, which my philosophy has not yet fathomed. By it one's eyes are often opened, and he seems to penetrate the profoundest mysteries of the universe, even to the essence of the God-head. We mark it in all our undertakings. Whatever we attempt, nothing doubting, we are almost sure to accomplish. Let me desire as a public speaker to produce a certain effect, and let me have full confidence that I shall succeed, and I am sure not to fail. Let me utter a sentence with my whole soul absorbed in it, confident that it is going right to the hearts of my hearers, and it goes there, and they are electrified. Whenever I am conscious in what I am saying of this calm, undoubting faith, I am sure of my audience. I no sooner open my lips than I have them at my command, and I can do with them as I please till I cease speaking. More than this; when I have felt this faith in what I was about to utter, I have

felt even before uttering it, its effect upon the assembly, and my whole frame has been sensible of something approaching an electric shock, and that they and I were connected by a sort of magnetic chain. In conversing with a friend too, in whom I have full faith, and to whom therefore I can speak with entire confidence, I have felt the same. Our souls seem to be melted into one, to move by one will, and each is strengthened and exalted by the combined power of both. Then we rise into the upper regions of truth, far above the unaided flight of either. Heaven opens to us, and we behold the hidden things of God. Something the same is felt when one goes forth in love with nature, and yields to her gentle and hallowing influence. We inhale power with her fragrant odors, and become conscious of loftier thoughts, of nobler feelings, and we form holier resolutions. Our very eyes glow with a brighter flame, our countenances assume a heavenlier hue, our frame becomes instinct with life and energy, and our step free and firm.

C. Nonsense! what seems to you so wonderful and mysterious, is nothing but the power of sympathy and imagination.

R. Will you be so good, Sir, as to explain to me what this power of sympathy is, and this power of imagination? Let us not fancy that we have removed our ignorance by giving it a name. I know that this power, is under one of its aspects called love, under another sympathy, under another imagination, under still another faith; but what it is in itself I know not. Be it, however, what it will, it is dæmonic, supernatural, an element in human nature, of which men in all ages have caught some glimpses, but of which we have as yet had only glimpses. I do not pretend to understand it. I stand in awe of it both when manifested in myself and in others. I regard it as the link which connects man with his Creator, and in it we may yet perhaps discover the secret of his redemption.

The history of our race bristles with prodigies. These prodigies were once accounted miracles, and

supposed to be wrought by the finger of the Divinity; now, an unbelieving age treats them as impostures, cheats, fabrications, proving nothing but people's love of the marvellous, and the ease with which they may be gulled. I believe them for the most part real. I believe that there are times when man has a power over the elements, and may make the spirits obey him. Who knows but the time will come, when the law by which this power operates will be discovered, and this power, which has been hitherto irregular and transient, will become common and regular in its influence; and therefore bear the marks of a fixed law of nature?

But, this power, be it what it may, is by no means identical with the human will, nor is it, in my belief, strictly speaking a property of human nature. It is an overshadowing, an all-pervading Power, most likely identical with the Power that creates and sustains the universe. We avail ourselves of it, not because it is ours, but by placing ourselves in harmony with it, or so that it flows as a mighty current through us.

Now, although I by no means comprehend this power, I find in its reality the principle of all my efforts at reform. By its light I proceed, and by its aid I hope to be able to set the human race forward towards a higher and a more glorious destiny.

Man is a complex being, the junction of two forces. He is both active and passive; he acts and is acted upon. His power to act is what I term the will. This, the proper human power, is unquestionably a reality, and must be exerted; but it is not alone sufficient. As a mere individual relying on my own strength alone, I am a feeble creature, and my strivings come to nothing. I will nobly, but perform pitiably. My will, that is, my own activity, must be brought into harmony with the activity of the universe, so that what in me are the active and the passive, free will and necessity, may conspire to the same end. When you would erect a mill, for instance, you so erect it as to bring the forces of nature to bear upon and drive your machinery. In all handiwork our study is to do the

same.* So in all our moral workings, our aim should be to place ourselves in such attitudes, that the moral forces of the universe shall work for us. "I can of mine own self do nothing; but through Christ, strengthening me, I can do all things," is the testimony of an inspired apostle to the doctrine I would establish. When once by love, sympathy, faith, I have placed myself in harmony with the law of the universe, that is, the will of God, my will is reinforced by the will of Omnipotence. Then nature, man, God works in me, for me, and I can do all things. The elements then are mine; the winds are my messengers, and flames of fire my ministers; for it is no longer I, but God himself that works.

This must explain to you the contradiction you have pointed out. Man acting alone, as a mere individual, is weak and pitiable; in harmony with his race, with nature, with God, is the sublime and godlike being I have called upon you to love and reverence.

Understand now the first principle of all real reform. You must study to place yourself in harmony with the law of the universe, and to avail yourself of the moral forces everywhere at work in it. The law of your race, the law of nature is a transcript of the will of your Creator. Whenever you overlook the factitious distinctions of men, and place yourself in harmony with the law of Humanity, you are in harmony with God, and act with his might to reinforce yours.

Reformers are weak and inefficient, because they go forth in their own strength, because they act from their own individuality, without regard to the will of God as manifested in the fundamental law of human nature. They have then for their aid nothing but their own individuality, which is the essence of weakness. You can do nothing for man in opposition to the law of

* See this finely illustrated in its bearing on Art, in a late number of the Dial, in a paper entitled "Thoughts on Art," — a paper which some of our wise newspaper critics have attempted to ridicule for its absurdity, but which is quite creditable to its distinguished author.

Humanity. Write if you will a book; bestow upon it all the labor, the strength of intellect, and power of genius you can, and it shall be counted a small affair, unless it meet, in some degree, the sympathies of the race, embody some of the views and wishes of mankind. It is purely idiosyncratic in its character. It may be read for the purpose of ascertaining your idiosyncracies, but for nothing else. It will exert no influence; it will not fasten itself on the public mind, and become an integral part of it. You alone produce it; it is your book. The human race does not assist at its birth, and will not contribute to its growth. No man, who stands alone, repels his race, and acts in opposition to them, can be a great man or do great things, however great he may be as an individual. A great man is one whom everybody conspires to make. If you cannot enlist the coöperation of your race, make yourself the focus in which are concentred all their thoughts, wishes, sympathies, hopes, and fears, you had better give up the idea of being a great man. You cannot be a great man in spite of your race. You can do nothing unless you can secure the aid of your fellow beings. What could have been a Washington, or *who* could have been a Washington, without the coöperation of his race? Or a Napoleon, had he not succeeded in securing the coöperation of the party in favor of New Institutions? So long as Napoleon could secure that coöperation he was invincible. He lived and acted in concert with Humanity, and was the centre and outlet of the general will. As soon as he lost that and sought merely an individual, a selfish good, what was he? The battle of Waterloo may answer. When Humanity coöperated with him, we called him a great man; he appeared able to do whatever he willed; he overran Europe in mere pastime, took an empire with the ease with which one takes his dinner, made and unmade kings with less trouble than one shifts his dress. But the power he wielded was not his, but Humanity's. Would you learn the power of the individual Napoleon, the energy of his will as a simple individual, go see

him on his Rock in the Ocean, quarrelling with his jailor about the quality of his wine. All men, as individuals, are pitiable creatures, the good and great no less than the bad and little. You can be nothing unless you can avail yourself of the coöperation of Humanity.

To bring us or to enable us to come into this harmony, there are two forces of which we must avail ourselves. The first is our individual will, or voluntary striving, the other the influence of society, understanding the word society, in its largest sense, together with its institutions of whatever name or nature. This is the influence on man from without. The voluntary strivings must be of two kinds, or have two different directions. In the first place we must strive to get the command of ourselves, and to bring all our wishes, purposes, feelings, passions, into harmony with the law we are to obey. This is what is enjoined upon us by the clergy, and moral reformers generally, as contradistinguished from social reformers. In this we may do something, but not much, as the history of six thousand years abundantly proves, and as our own experience of the weakness of our wills but too clearly demonstrates. The other direction of our voluntary strivings must be towards society, to the moulding of the institutions which act upon us. This is the direction taken by the social reformers proper. But I, who am never satisfied with anything exclusive, contend for both, and would always combine the moral reformers with the social. As a moral reformer, I must study to harmonize my own moral nature; as a social reformer, I must aim to make all the influences, which come from without, push us towards the destiny we would accomplish.

If we look at the world as it is, we shall find that the social influences, which act upon us, have a corrupting tendency. Society, as now organized, tends to develop the lower propensities of our nature, and to unfit us for obeying the higher law of Humanity; stimulates from the first the passions to which we cannot yield without moral degradation. All, or nearly

all social tendencies, of which we are now the victims, serve to stimulate the three passions of love, ambition, avarice. To enjoy love, in its lowest sense, to become distinguished and famous, to obtain large possessions, are what we are impelled to by the books we read, the examples we see, and the influences to which we are subjected. These are so early developed in us, that if we have any largeness of nature, we are never able in after life fully to control them. If we are weak beings by nature, possessing the faculties common to our nature only in a mediocre degree, we may pass along without running into any excess, or experiencing any great difficulty in maintaining what is called self-control. But if we have rich natures, the various tendencies which belong to our nature, in their highest degree, if we are born nature's noblemen, with the strength and energy of faculties to distinguish ourselves from the common level, we either waste our lives and suffer the tortures of hell in seeking to restrain our passions, or we run into guilty excesses, and create the impression, that a great man is almost necessarily a great sinner.

In fact all the influences upon us from without are deleterious, and deprive us of moral strength, just in proportion as they stimulate our passions. Temptations are soon thick around us. We are beset on either hand by enemies to our virtue. We are weak and in want of help. This help society does not give. She multiplies these temptations, reinforces our enemies, then leaves us to the combat, and punishes if we do not conquer. She smooths the road to hell, and makes that to virtue steep and rugged.

> "facilis descensus averni:
> Noctes atque dies patet atri janua Ditis:
> Sed revocare gradum, superasque evadere ad auras,
> Hoc opus, hic labor est."

Nearly all the instruction we receive tends to give the world, the flesh, and the devil dominion over us. In our infancy we are hushed by falsehood, or quieted by baubles; in youth our brains are drilled

out by the priest and pedagogue; and in manhood dried up by intercourse with the world. From earliest childhood we are accustomed to see things valued in an inverse ratio to their real worth, place, wealth, or fashion control the many, and to find regarded as the nobility of the race not those who labor honestly and efficiently for mankind, but those who have been most successful in love, avarice, or ambition. A poor man who gets tipsy is brought up before your city police and fined or sent to the house of correction; a rich man may get drunk in his own house and be carried to his bed he knows not when or how, and yet be counted a gentleman. He who kills but one man is a murderer; he who can kill or cause thousands to be killed is a hero; and everything else in society is of the same stamp. Is virtue possible, — I mean virtue beyond the virtue of intention, — is virtue possible in such a state of society? He who would be strictly honest, unless he have some capital in advance, must beg or starve. Men live by cheating, — grow rich by cheating, — high-minded, honorable men, by cheating. A man, by way of commerce, may rob, make poor, a thousand widows and orphans in some uncivilized island of the ocean, and yet be one of our first and most respectable citizens. And if, out of his superabounding wealth, he give a few hundreds to some benevolent society, as old sinners formerly made donations to the Church, he shall be praised in all the public prints, and held up as one whom every young man should study to imitate. He who by some strange mischance finds himself encumbered with a conscience somewhat tender, and disposed to inquire into the rectitude of his doings, is counted a mere simpleton by the business world. Go on 'change, into a bank, a broker's office, a factory, or into any of your legislative halls or courts of justice, if you would ascertain what are one's chances of being virtuous in society as it is. Or go into the charmed circles of Fashion, or into one of your popular churches, if you would learn the temptations to sin, which society furnishes and will furnish as long as it remains in its present

half-civilized state. Fashion makes people afraid to act themselves and enjoy themselves in their own way, lest their fashionable acquaintances *cut* them; and the church makes them afraid to think freely and utter themselves honestly, lest they be turned out of the synagogue, and sent to hell before their time.

C. Come, come, man, you are growing crazy.

R. Would to God I were crazy. Would to God the evils I see were only the visions of my own disordered fancy. Would to God all I have uttered were but the ravings of the madman. But I fear, Sir, that I am but too sane. I fear that it will be found that what I say is but too true. I shall not be believed now. I know my fate. I know I am doomed to utter prophecies that will not be believed. Yet I must speak. I must lay down my burden, however bitterly I may weep to foresee that it will be disregarded. No matter. I speak not in wrath; I blame not individuals; I know human weakness; I know what men have to combat, and my heart bleeds for them. If, as I glance at their conduct, I sometimes find my mind growing dark and perplexed, and a curse rises in the bitterness of my soul to my lips, I check myself, and lay the blame to systems and not to individuals. Individuals are our brothers; they are made as you and I are; they would do good; the basest of them kindles up at sight of the disinterested and the heroic; the most abandoned love virtue, and long to return to their Father's house and hold communion with the wise and good; but alas, the temptations to sin are too strong; a false standard of worth, a wrongly organized society, mischievous social influences hurry them onward and downward to hell. O, Sir, I would not censure a single human being as an individual. I know not what struggles may have torn the bosom of that poor brother they are dragging to prison, on whom that iron door is soon to be closed and those bolts are to be drawn. I know not how those, whom society brands as felons, may have struggled to be good and great, and till I do, I dare not condemn them. The hardened villain, as he was called,

who, a few days since was choked to death by law, may have started in life wtth a noble ambition, with warm and generous sympathies, looking forward to be one of the greatest and best of the human race. Had his heart been responded to by society, had he found the influence needed to bring out in full glory and omnipotence the infant god within him, who can tell what he might not have been? Who can tell the efforts he had made, the good resolutions he had formed, and the anguish he had suffered, the fire which had burned within him, the hell which had consumed him! O, if the hearts of those, we most condemn, were laid open to our inspection, could we but see their workings, examine their scars, and judge of their conflicts with sin and the devil, and know how a word, a thoughtless word, a discouraging look, a temptation thrown in their way by that very society which condemns, hangs, or imprisons them, has proved their ruin, overpowered them, sunk them, as the feather too much broke the camel's back, my life on it, we should find infinitely more to commisserate and forgive, than to condemn and punish.

And yet, Sir, do not fancy that I am a whit more charitable than I was yesterday. I admit men are weak rather than wicked, and the depravities of their character I am disposed to charge to the depravities of the social state, rather than to the perversity of their wills; nevertheless they are not wholly blameless. Man is not wholly a passive being. He can act as well as be acted upon. If circumstances act upon him, up to a certain extent, he can act upon them, and so modify them that their reaction upon him shall be salutary. I blame individuals, not because they cannot, by a mere effort of volition, make themselves high-minded and virtuous beings; but because they do not exert the moral power given them to mould society, so that it may be in harmony with the higher laws of man's nature. I blame you, Sir, as a rich man, that instead of making the social influences to which we are exposed favorable to the growth of moral excel-

lence, you have been intent merely on amassing an estate. I blame the learned and the gifted, because they devote their learning and gifts, not to the improvement of man's social condition, but to their own aggrandisement. I blame politicians and statesmen for their selfishness and neglect of the true end of government, — the elevation of man.

C. And what would you have these men you blame attempt for the elevation of man, as you term it?

R. Much. But I am fatigued now, and you must wait for my answer till I am disposed to give it.

Art. II. — *The Laboring Classes in the Age of Chivalry.*

"The age of Chivalry is gone!" exclaimed Mr. Burke in one of those brilliant speeches of his, which, entrancing the imagination, led reason captive in her train; and a thousand voices have caught the sound, reëchoing wherever the English language is spoken — "The age of Chivalry is gone!" — loudly and mournfully, as if in its departure, society had incurred some strange and irremediable loss. The age of chivalry has been bewept and bewailed in poetry and prose. Its apotheosis has been sung in every possible metre, the disconsolate bards gazing wistfully where it soars away among the stars, and no Elijah's mantle falling upon them to bid them revive the departing era. The very school-boy to whom that celebrated "apostrophe to the Queen of France" is given as an oratorical exercise, catches the sentiment with the style, and lifts also his little voice in lamentation. So continually are these changes rung in our ears, that we almost involuntarily join the general cry and contribute with full throat to swell the melancholy chorus — "The age of Chivalry is gone!"

Chivalry is gone, and thank God for it! Would too

we could say that its remains and influences had followed it! It was evil, and its age was evil. In the inscrutable dealings of a wise Providence, it doubtless had its uses and its mission. Its mission done, what else did it deserve but to be abolished? Conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity, it could no longer be allowed to cumber the earth. Its origin was in that ever-flowing fountain of bitter waters, the insane pride of the human heart. When the chief of one of those savage tribes of the North, which overran the Roman empire summoned his men to the field, the *caballerus* or cavalier, who could appear on horseback, looked with disdain on his humbler fellow vassal, who could only follow the wars on foot. In this simple fact we perceive at once the rise and the spirit of chivalry. Pedestrianism was the token of inferiority, for human nature was the same then as now, when prim "Respectability, who keeps her gig," dashes along the highway, careless what humble footmen are bespattered by her hurrying wheels. In process of time, however, it became something more, the distinction between the two classes grew wider as a new form of society was established. The horsemen became more exclusive; and we finally see them constituting a distinct order enjoying immunities and privileges, which could be entered only by a regular investiture of the candidate with arms by some conspicuous member, after sufficient proof of desert had been given.

But it is not in this aspect that chivalry particularly interests us. The word, as we use it, is made to signify in the main a sentiment originating in this institution and pervading and governing society, — a conventional code, recognised by the superior classes as their rule of conduct, and as such we apply it to the description of individual action and character. In this view, chivalry may be regarded as threefold, consisting of the sentiments of loyalty, knightly honor, and gallantry. Among its highest duties was obedience to superiors. When the vassal, kneeling before his lord, vowed to be his true and faithful man, he resigned the control of all his

actions within certain limits, and believed himself bound to service by the holiest of ties. Hence blind devotion to the commands of a master was cherished as a sacred duty, and men resigned themselves to a slavish subserviency to usurped authority, submitting daily to the most degrading marks of inferiority. It is true that the gradation of ranks and the practice of sub-infeudation, by giving to the greater vassals still others who did homage to them as they to their lords, kept alive among them a degree of personal dignity and independence inconsistent with the assumption of despotic authority by the monarch, as was proved at Runnymede. This however was confined to the class of barons, and never reached the great mass of the people. For them no right nor liberty was ever dreamed of. They recognised the authority of their oppressors as valid, and bowed down to it as of divine institution. Even among the nobles, the constant practice of homage could not allow of any true, manly feeling of personal freedom.

The only rule of conduct acknowledged by the knight was the law of honor, his only tribunal the opinion of his comrades, or of the ladies; and the only punishment he feared was disgrace. No eternal principles of right and wrong were comprehended; an empty conventionality was substituted for the law of God, and conscience was dethroned, that vanity might take her place. If vanity was unwounded, all was well. Any derogation from personal dignity was a greater evil than the commission of crime. If a knight of the Spanish order of the Golden Spur was convicted of the exercise of any handicraft art, no matter what was the necessity, he was degraded from the knighthood; and yet all history proves that he might have practised the greatest enormities without meeting so heavy a punishment. In such a society there could be no high tone of morality, and the general prevalence of rapacity, violence, and licentiousness, proves how insufficient was their boasted law of honor.

The third and only redeeming feature of chival-

ry was the position it gave to the gentler sex. In all the nations of antiquity, woman was degraded, subjected to innumerable restraints, and made man's menial, or the slave of his passions. But now she assumed her true rank, and became his equal and companion, sharing alike his triumphs and his afflictions, — inciting him to exertion, calming his ruffled passions, and soothing his woes. Sentiment took the place of appetite; the poetry of love was at once created, bestrewing men's daily walks with new life and beauty. "It was," says Shelley,* "as if the statues of Apollo and the muses had been endowed with life and motion, and walked forth among their worshippers; so that earth became peopled with the inhabitants of a diviner world. The familiar appearance and proceedings of life became wonderful and heavenly, and a paradise was created as out of the wrecks of Eden."

The great object of the true knight, for which he exerted all his prowess, was the favor of the maiden to whom he had vowed allegiance, and whose colors he wore. In the heat of the conflict his exclamation was, "Ah, if my lady did but see me now!" and her smiles were an ample reward. In this feeling has originated all that romance of chivalry, which makes it appear to us less a matter of history than a pleasant dream, and which serves to hide from us even yet its darker features. A new poetry was created. The old ballads, which were little more than the rude war-songs of barbarians, sometimes rising into almost epic grandeur, as in the famous German Nibelungen song, but always preserving their iron sternness, gave way to the glittering lays of courtly Troubadours and Minnesängers. These were welcome guests in hall and bower, singing of knightly exploits and the beauty and faith of ladies fair.

Fantastical as was the devotion they painted, and loose as was the morality they sometimes inculcated,

---

* Defence of Poetry, in Essays, &c., vol. I. p. 47.

their lays yet exerted a softening and humanizing influence upon society. The gallant knights learned to seek for favor by other means than feats of arms, and cultivated the gentler arts of life. They vied with each other in the brilliancy of their appointments, the richness of their apparel, and the splendor of their retinue. Luxury produced refinement. Gay tournaments were established, where they might splinter a lance in mimic warfare before the eyes of their ladies, charming them with their valor while they dazzled them with their magnificence. The splendor of these occasions, as described by contemporary authors, almost exceeds our imaginations, and the whole moves before us more like the pomp of scenic show than the realities of ordinary life. It is this aspect of chivalry that we are alone in the habit of regarding; and we have dwelt upon it till we have now come to consider its era one of gold, the carnival of time, when life itself was but a pastime, and mankind revelled in universal gayety, the dull cares of a weary world a while forgotten.

There is another side of the picture, however, almost unnoticed, but which a wiser judgment will deem more important, if less agreeable. We are prone to regard only the brighter aspect of any particular time which does not interfere with our prejudices. Gazing upon the beauty of the veil that imagination casts over it, we never lift it to see the hideous deformity that lies beneath. Even where we know the darkest wrong must have obtained, we turn our attention only to the fairer features, until it is hid from our view, as the later and more refined Egyptians covered with gay wreaths of flowers the grinning skeleton that sate in naked ghastliness at the festive board of their sterner fathers. The pageantry of chivalry was supported at no trifling cost. It pertained only to the noble, who were indeed clothed in purple and fine linen and fared sumptuously every day. But beneath these were the mass of the population, the dumb millions from whom no voice has reached us, save in those occasional out-

breaks of servile desperation so quickly settled by the panacea of the sword. These, by their unceasing toil, their sweat and blood, maintained that gaudy pomp upon which they were allowed to gaze only from the distance, bowing submissively to the haughty insolence of the masters who snatched from them the hard produce of their labor, leaving them scarce a sustenance. The productions of the earth were free to all save their producers, and the exhausted husbandman, worn with toil and stripes, with starvation, brooding over his cheerless hovel, lay down to die on fields whence the rich harvest had just been gathered into the granary of his lord. He that ploughed, ploughed not in hope; and the sickle hung heavy in the weary hand that could scarce expect to glean even the scattered ears of the store it reaped. This too in your lamented age of chivalry! "It is written in the law of Moses," says Paul, "thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen?" * And if for oxen, shall he have no regard for those made in his image, groaning beneath a yet heavier burden? And if the inarticulate cries and sobbings of a dumb creature in pain in the ear of Heaven are prayers, could it be deaf to the half-articulate wailings that rose in all Europe for long ages from a people sunk in "dull obstruction," involved in thick darkness of ignorance and superstition, trodden down by the iron heel of military despotism, and no ray of light allowed to pierce their gloom to speak of hope here or hereafter? Nor can we without sin pass lightly by the darker features of that evil time and dare to despise its complainings, when the Apostle tells us "the cries of them that have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabbaoth." †

It possesses, too, another claim upon our attention, as Americans. These groaning millions were our ancestors. We are a colony of European proletaries; for our wide territories have been peopled by the vol-

---

* 1 Corinth. ix. 9. † James v. 4.

untary expatriation of the industrious classes seeking a refuge from oppression and exaction. The nobilities and hierarchies of Europe had no hand in our establishment, for it was to escape them that our fathers dared the perils of the ocean and the forest. Let us not then forget the hole of the pit from which we were digged, but rejoice in our deliverance, and be thankful that for us, even more than for our transatlantic brethren, "the age of chivalry is gone."

One of the most fruitful sources of oppression was the ostentation of the aristocracy, both lay, and clerical. This was carried to the most inordinate extent. The knights were rivals, not alone in arms, but in the costliness of their apparel, the jewels, gold, and precious robes of the East with which they decorated their persons, their arms, their retainers, even their horses. This rivalry was fostered by the rich productions of oriental countries made known to Europe by the Crusades, and reached its height at the famous interview between Francis the First and Henry the Eighth, near Calais, known as *the field of the cloth of Gold*, — a scene of such unparalleled magnificence as the world had never witnessed, and whose gay trappings cost many of the nobility of France and England the bulk of their estates. Such displays could be supported only by grinding the faces of the poor, and exacting the last penny from the laborer in the shape of fines, tithes, aids, reliefs, taillages, and every other species of legalized robbery. They also tended to produce a profound respect for rank and wealth, and a corresponding contempt for honest industry.

This is one of the most authentic products of chivalry, and one too which survives in scarcely diminished vigor at the present day. The distinction of gentle and simple was religiously observed. The noble towered above his fellow-men, as a being of a superior race. The only profession he could embrace was arms, all useful employments being left to men of low birth. Yet the men appear to have imparted more baseness to their offices, than the offices to them. The most me-

nial services were not degrading, if paid to one of superior rank; and important fiefs were often held by the performance of such. As remarked by a quaint French writer, at a later day, "to serve as a domestic is a general humiliation throughout Europe; to be the lacquey of a prince is an honor to be bought at the price of gold, and a life full of contradictions, humiliations, torments, and meannesses." * When the newly crowned Emperor of Germany sate at his royal banquet, with his electors around him, to use the strong figure of Schiller, like the strong choir round the sun in Heaven, the Pfalsgraf of the Rhine carried the dishes, the Duke of Bohemia acted as cupbearer, and all the rest waited in equally servile attitudes.

Neither indeed could such services be performed by any but the noble. At the coronation of Richard the Second, John Wiltshire, a citizen of London, claimed, in virtue of some old charter, the right of holding the towel when the royal hands were washed before dinner. His claim to this high station could not be disputed, but his rank was too low to admit of his holding it. Never before had the college of heralds been in such a predicament, and the whole court was in consternation, until some subtle wit solved the difficulty, and plain John Wiltshire was allowed to perform the much-desired duty, by his deputy, the Earl of Cambridge.

Yet labor was degrading in the extreme, and even involved a loss of caste. Had some Louis the Sixteenth exercised his talents at lock-making in those days, or a Ferdinand the Seventh displayed his taste in embroidery, all the chivalry of his realm would have been in commotion. Mills gives an amusing instance of the prevalent contempt for mechanical occupations, when he tells us, with all seriousness, that the reason for the discontinuance of the use of the battle-axe in war was, "that the polite and courteous knights thought it ungentle to employ a weapon associated with ideas of trade;" † — the weapon that had been polluted by the

* Lequinio. Les prejuges detruits. † History of Chivalry.

hewing of timber was unfit for the knocking out of brains! To preserve the distinctions thus created, were invented titles of rank, surnames, and heraldic devices. The governors of counties appear very early to have assumed the names of their provinces, and soon after every petty lord affixed to his Christian name that of his castle or its nearest town. Surnames originated in family pride, sometimes in this way, and at others from some trivial circumstance, as that of the royal house of Plantagenet, from the broom-plant which its founder wore as a crest. But these were not sufficient. Something was required which might strike the eye, and heraldry was invented. The rude image with which the Teutonic savage decorated his shield, as our Indian does his person with war-paint, became an evidence of rank, and gave rise to the whole art of blazonry. Each family had its device, its crest, and its legend, and the arms of the individual, by their appropriate quarterings, proved how many degrees he was removed from the contamination of plebeian blood.

The effect of all this upon the lower classes was necessarily unfavorable. Daily insult was added to daily injury. They could not raise their eyes without beholding some visible mark of their degradation. Everywhere they met the symbols of their inferiority, and indeed it has been one of the hardest tasks of succeeding ages to overcome these, the spirit and the empty forms of feudalism remaining long after its substance had departed. The complaints of the representatives of the third estate in the States General of France, that but one side of the folding doors at Versailles was thrown open to admit them to the royal presence, have sometimes been cited as an instance of inordinate vanity. Considered alone, they may appear as such; but we must recollect that this was a form universally understood to imply inferiority, and of course appeared a premeditated indignity. It was one of the last struggles of feudal arrogance, and the resentment shown upon the occasion was the natural reluctance of men upon whom the promise of a better

era had dawned, to submit to the well-known sign of their old-world social abasement. That day, when George Fox and his humble followers first declared themselves forbidden by the Spirit to doff their hats to king or kaiser, is among the most notable in the history of mankind; for it was the bold proclamation of the essential dignity of Man, and the equality of the race. Perhaps the most significant scene of the earlier days of the French revolution was that meeting of the States General when, the king and noblesse having covered themselves, the the third estate also clapped on their slouched hats; proclaiming, by this simple action, more forcibly than any form of words could have done, that the old order of things was passing away, and that a new power had arisen to govern France. In the dark ages, however, these symbols were regarded as sacred; so that the dull crowd succumbed to what appeared an inevitable fate, and glared from lustreless eyes on the pomp around them, little dreaming it was but their transmuted toil.

At the beginning of the eleventh century, when the feudal system was fairly established throughout Europe, and chivalry was beginning to display its splendor, the population was divided into two classes, — masters and slaves. The latter were known as serfs, and from their dwelling in little clusters of huts, or villæ, on the domain of their lords, as *villeins*. It is worthy of note, as an indication of the spirit of the time, that this term, with others used to designate the poor, such as *knave* and *churl*, has descended to us as a term of reproach, used only in the worst sense. The class of serfs had been found in servitude by the Germanic tribes, when they overran the Empire, or had been reduced to it by conquest and violence. Freemen appear also to have sold themselves into slavery, during seasons of want, to escape starvation. There existed always, in France more particularly, a few free allodial proprietors, not noble, but most of them were obliged to acknowledge themselves the vassals of some suzerain, in order to escape the rapacity of the nobility at large.

A small number of the wealthier purchased safety by the payment of an annual fine, and maintained the position of clients, rather than of vassals, whence freedom did not necessarily imply nobility. The mass, however, were in a state of unmitigated slavery. The master had the power of life and death in most cases, and in all could imprison his serfs at will, "being," says a writer of the time, "accountable to none but God." * He had an unbounded right to their labor and its fruits. They could be impledged for the payment of debts, or sold as merchandise, although sometimes attached to the soil, and transferable only with it. They were frequently sold into foreign lands. Shortly after the conquest, large numbers of English serfs were sold into Scotland and Ireland, and the early merchants of Venice made Europeans as plenty in the slave-markets of the Saracens, as Georgians are at Constantinople now. They could not testify against a freeman in courts of justice. They might be branded or marked, so as to be more readily identified. And an Anglo-Saxon law enjoins every man to "know his own team of men, of horses, and of oxen." Of so little value were they in Arragon, that in the case of difficult partition of an estate, the sons of the deceased master might resort to Solomon's judgment, and divide the subject of dispute in pieces by the sword. Marriage was unknown among them for ages, no priest condescending to bless the union, which he taught them to consider a holy sacrament. When it was allowed among them, they could not wed without the lord's license, and great precautions were taken to prevent their intermarriage with those of purer blood. Among the Lombards, the woman who married a serf might be lawfully killed by her relations; while in France she became a serf also. By a law of Pepin, if a freeman married a villein, believing her to be free, he might repudiate her at will.

The *Wehrgeld*, or as it may be properly termed, the price of blood, also affords a curious scale of the com-

* Beaumanoir, in Hallam, Middle Ages, i. 123.

parative value of the various orders of society. Among the Burgundians, the fine for the murder of the Duke was 960 solidi, for that of a serf but 20. According to the Anglo-Saxon laws, the proportion was still more striking, the value of a peasant's life being to that of the king's, as 1 to 115. Even in the same rank, a man was valuable in proportion to his wealth. Among the Franks, the fine for a Roman tributary was 100 solidi if he owned land, 45 if he had none. So in the ceremony of compurgation, the Saxon laws make the oath of a man owning twelve hydes of land equivalent to that of six churls; — his veracity being supposed to increase in the direct ratio of his property.

Such being their social position, their religious and physical condition may easily be imagined, — both of utter destitution. No light from above beamed upon their benighted souls. The professed followers of him who came to preach the gospel to the poor had no word of comfort or of hope for them. Their only faith was a brutal superstition; their only worship a semi-christianized idolatry.

The most ordinary comforts and conveniences of life were unknown to them. If chivalry does appear to us a glittering masque, we have here the anti-masque, by which our fathers heightened the effect of their shows, not indeed in mimic misery, but in all too stern reality. Were the magic mirror of Cornelius Agrippa no fable, and any of us should ask to behold one of our ancestors of this period, we should perhaps find him some squalid figure, scarce protected by his scanty robe of skins, looking only stupid ferocity from beneath his matted shag of hair, bowed with toil, scarred with stripes, branded with the visible sign of slavery, the iron collar about his neck, crouching in his filthy kennel over a savage meal. Such indeed were two thirds of the population of Europe in the palmy days of chivalry.

But all society possesses fortunately a recuperative energy, and will work out its own cure sooner or later. It may sometimes be effected gradually, sometimes sud-

denly, and the remedies required may be of a heroic character, as in the destruction of a Roman empire, or a French revolution; yet one way or another it will be done. This is especially the case with new communities, — such as that we are now considering, — with their youthful force and vigor. Here, the great prerequisite to all farther amelioration was the emancipation of the class of villeins. And this was finally accomplished. It constitutes the first grand step in the progress of modern European civilization, and although comparatively unnoticed, the most important; without which the others would have been worthless, or indeed could not have taken place. The means by which it was brought about are various, and all interesting. The first and most effectual rested with the serfs themselves. The lords, constantly employed in war or the chase, found it impossible to pay a sufficient degre of attention to the laborers scattered over their domains to secure their industry, nor could they well employ superintendents, for none of noble blood would accept the office, and a plebeian might naturally be expected to sympathize with his fellows. Rewards for diligence were therefore found preferable to punishments for idleness. Those serfs, whose portions of land produced most freely, received at first a gratuity, which, in course of time, was converted into regular wages, which they might dispose of at their pleasure. In some instances an express stipulation was entered into, that the reward should depend upon the fertility of the soil, the laborer retaining his just proportion of the produce, — a practice which still exists in Scotland, the landlord providing the stock and receiving a rent in kind. Many serfs thus acquired a considerable amount of property, and purchased their freedom; or, being able to stock their own farms, offered the landlord instead of his share a fixed rent in money, — an offer which he would willingly accept, as giving him a certain revenue and freeing him from the risk of accidental losses. Agriculture flourished under these circumstances, the face of the country was changed, and

markets were created. The right of villeins to separate property was tacitly admitted. A demand for improved lands arose, and the tenant was frequently ejected to make way for a higher bidder, before he could be remunerated for the improvements he had made; whence leases for a term of years came into use. By such proceedings, however, the lord acknowledged the capacity of the laborer to hold property in his own right, and thus virtually gave him his freedom. Whatever little mechanical art existed was practised by slaves. Each manor would have its smith, perhaps its miller, carpenter, weaver, or mason. These were often employed by the lord and by their fellows, and received rewards, which accumulating enabled them also to purchase freedom.

But purchase was not the only means of escape. Voluntary emancipation was frequent from several causes. Any extraordinary service on the part of a villein was rewarded with a deed of manumission. Sometimes they were employed in war, and excited to greater valor by the promise of enfranchisement, as happened most frequently in Italy, and in England during the wars of the two roses. The clergy also interfered in their behalf, and exhorted departing souls to seek for peace by freeing those whom they had held in bondage. Millar, in his learned treatise on the Origin of Ranks, disputes this fact, and asserts boldly, that Christianity had no hand in the matter. He even refers to the condition of Onesimus, as mentioned by Paul, in his epistle to Philemon, and various other passages of the scriptures, to prove that they could not be properly used for this purpose; and he goes so far as to do the Quakers of Pennsylvania the honor of declaring, that they are the first body of men that ever considered the abolition of slavery a duty to religion and humanity. In this, however, he is guilty of two capital errors. He miscomprehends the whole scope of the sacred writings upon the subject, arguing that because Paul did not exhort Philemon to free his bondman, he therefore approved the institution of slavery. But the early

teachers of our faith mingled the wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove. They had a great work to do, and they could not leave their course to remove every little grievance by the way-side. Their mission was to find an audience in the minds of men for those eternal principles of truth and justice, which, like good seed sown upon good ground, would spring up into celestial life and vigor, and bear a blessed fruit through all coming ages. By this means the evils complained of would be but the sooner eradicated. Jesus has taught us doctrines which lay the axe at the root of every despotism upon earth, and which hurl the sceptre and the purple back into the pit from which they rose; and yet he told his followers to pay tribute, rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. So Paul allowed Onesimus to remain in bonds, contented to lay the foundations of Christian liberty for future generations, without exasperating men by an active denunciatory war against existing institutions, and thus closing their ears and hearts against his ministry; — an example which it is to be desired that certain well-meaning but ill-judging people of our own time would imitate.

Millar also loses sight of the all-important distinction between *Christianity* and the *Church.* The glorious teachings of the Bible could not remain altogether hidden, and, wherever known, they produce the appropriate effect. The plebeian of the ancient world looked up with reverence to the patrician in whose veins ran the rich blood of demigods, but the modern serf soon learned the origin of his race from a common head. In the dim twilight of his prison-house there reached him some glimpses of that great Evangile, which taught him to consider all men as brethren and children of one heavenly Parent, and looking on the differences that obtained, he could cry with the bitter exclamation of Esau: — "Hast thou but one blessing, O my father!" Here is the answer to those who would ask what Christianity has done for civilization. It is the knowledge of this glorious principle which, working like se-

cret fire in the souls of men for centuries, has carried us thus far upon our journey, and which will yet lead society to its final deliverance. It found its way to the hovel of the slave, and the gloomy dungeon and charnel-house, where he toiled with no hope of rest but the grave, became again a flowery world, with bright azure sky, beaming with the spirits of love and faith. It dwelt with him too, and fructified abundantly, until at the rebellion of Wat Tyler chivalry stood aghast to hear it proclaimed in that rude couplet, which was the peasant's war-song : —

> When Adam delved and Eva span,
> Where was then the gentleman?

But for the church so much cannot be said. The action of individual prelates or ecclesiastical bodies upon the subject would vary according to particular interests. There were doubtless among the clergy zealous, charitable, and simple-minded men, who would seek to improve the condition of their fellow-beings by procuring their liberty. The lower classes too, being more readily influenced than the turbulent barons, priests of a different character would desire their emancipation in order to set them against their lords. By means of their influence, many persons upon their deathbeads were induced to manumit their serfs. Deeds of this character are still extant, declaring it to be done for the remission of the master's sins, and one dated in the fifteenth century commences with the words, singular for that age, "*seeing that God in the beginning made all men by nature equal.*" Other instruments state that it is done for the love of God, for the good of the lord's soul, or that of some deceased relative. Bulls were issued by some of the Popes recommending universal emancipation. All those serfs, moreover, who took holy orders were freed by that fact, and would of course exert their priestly powers to obtain the same blessing for their kinsmen. Yet with all this it is somewhat remarkable, that throughout Europe the villeins upon church lands were the last manumitted. It was easier to recommend self-sacrifice than to practise

it. The priesthood could not easily reconcile itself to being shorn of so much grandeur and power, and accordingly we have still existing ecclesiastical regulations denouncing the emancipation of church villeins as a sin, and requiring the bishop who should for any reason free one, to restore two in his place. Let us not, however, do injustice to the church in the middle ages. Inefficient as it was, it was nevertheless the only moral power of its time, and as such demands our respect and regard. When the right of the strongest prevailed universally, its solitary voice was raised, appealing to conscience, and proclaiming a higher law than that of force.*

Freedom was obtained also by still other means. The crown, in most countries, finding itself encroached upon by the insolence of the barons, sought to destroy them by elevating a new power in the Third Estate. The kings of France converted the service of most of the villeins upon their domains into a fixed rent at an early day, and gave them other privileges. But their most efficient mode of attaining their object was by the encouragement of free towns. These acquired charters from the favor of the king or their lords, or, as was most generally the case, by purchase. They soon attained importance by their manufactures and commerce, and fostered by royal patronage, bid defiance to their former masters. Their most important privilege was that of conferring liberty upon villeins who might take refuge within their walls, a year and a day being the general period, beyond which they could not be reclaimed. Some, after thus obtaining citizenship, returned to their farms with the power of calling upon their towns for assistance in case of attack or injury. Others again became free by default on the part of their lords, who, by neglecting to exact villein-service for a length of time, became unable to prove in a court of justice that they or their ancestors had ever received such service from the person claimed or his ancestors. Many

* Guizot. Essais sur l'histoire de France.

cases of this kind occurred at the restoration of peace under Henry the Seventh, but the courts favoring the villeins, the claims were generally unsuccessful.*

By these means was European slavery gradually abolished. In the twelfth century the master's power over life was extinguished, punishments were more moderate, and villeins were allowed to hold separate property. In Italy it was declared to have disappeared as early as the beginning of the fourteenth century. The last mention made of it by statute in England, was in the reign of Elizabeth, but isolated cases were to be met with at a much later date. In Scotland, the colliers and salters remained in this miserable state until a little more than a half century ago. In France it prevailed over entire provinces until the Revolution.

The condition of the laboring community was now materially changed. Occupying land at rent or in their own right, and receiving fixed wages in money for their labor, they were in a degree their own masters, and could enjoy the fruits of their industry, which thereby received a powerful stimulus. They could no longer expect to be maintained by their masters in case of sickness or old age, and were thus led to greater carefulness and thrift. The condition of ordinary day laborers was indeed little bettered, but that of merchants and mechanics improved rapidly. The latter were always highly esteemed, especially those who had a knowledge of the finer arts, so that according to the Burgundian laws we find the *Wehrgeld* of an expert worker in gold as high as that of the intendant of a royal domain. As luxury and refinement increased, they were still more in demand, and acquired wealth, influence, and social standing. So also of merchants. The little retail trade originally carried on in the towns, expanded into a foreign commerce, especially after the crusades had given Europe a knowledge of the rich commodities of the East. It was through this traffic and their manufactures that the free cities of Italy rose

* Sullivan. Lectures on the laws of England. LXXV.

into power and splendor, and that Venice in particular attained her unexampled prosperity, and became for a time the metropolis of the world, "her merchants princes and each deck a throne."

One of the most striking features of the time is the institution of Guilds, or associations of workmen or traders. They originally included all the tradesmen of a particular town, afterwards were divided into those of merchants and of artificers, and finally each trade had its own guild. Their objects were mutual encouragement and protection, the advancement of their art, and the relief of indigent members. They were held by virtue of royal charters, and gradually monopolized the exercise of their particular callings. The various trades were kept distinct, even as regarded their residence in large cities, the mechanics of London dwelling in their separate quarters so late as the reign of Richard the Second. In the Italian cities they acquired the right of bearing arms in the twelfth century, and soon became the dominant power, each company being led to battle by its own gonfaloniere. As the wealth of these increased, the nobles lost all influence, and in Florence were excluded from all participation in affairs of state, so that they sought the abolition of their rank, and admission among the people as a favor, while unpopular plebeians were readily punished and put out of the way by a patent of nobility. The Flemish cities rose to an almost equal degree of prosperity. When Joanna of Navarre, the queen of Philip the Fair of France, visited Bruges, in 1301, she was so struck with the magnificence of the tradesmen's wives, that she exclaimed bitterly: — "I thought I had been the only queen here, but I find there are many hundreds more!"

The towns entered into leagues for mutual defence, which sometimes enabled them to set even royal power at defiance. The most famous of these were the league of the Rhine, and, at a later period, the great Hanseatic league. The first of these was formed expressly for protection against the barons, who formed

counter-leagues, and entered into open war with the towns. We perceive now the rise of that spirit of voluntary association, which in later times has produced such astonishing results. Some of the societies formed were open, as those authorized in France by Louis the Gross, in which the burghers confederated under oath for the common safety, whence they are spoken of as *conjurati.* Secret societies also had an early origin, being not unknown among the Anglo-Saxons. Some of them attained immense power, taking upon themselves the functions of judge, jury, and executioner, in times when universal lawlessness made the regular courts inefficient. Of this character was the Westphalian Femgericht, which, shrouded in mystery, hung like a Diocles' sword over all Germany, unseen but in the terrible vengeance that fell upon all who offended it. Freemasonry appears to have been a combination of two of the forms mentioned, the order being at first a trade society, afterwards assuming a secret and mystical character. Notwithstanding the high claims to antiquity, advanced by its friends, going back to the building of Solomon's temple, (and one might naturally suppose from the confusion of tongues concerning its true nature and history, of the tower of Babel also,) it cannot be traced with any distinctness beyond A. D. 900.* Companies of architects are noticed by early writers, travelling from place to place, sometimes under the protection of a papal bull, and engaged in the erection of churches and other public edifices. With the monopolizing spirit of the age, they kept their art a secret, met privately, and invented signs for mutual recognition. Their union would necessarily be made still stronger in England by the tyrannical acts of Edward the Third, in impressing masons to work at his own prices on his buildings, and by the statute of Henry the Sixth for the suppression of their chapters. They differed from the trade guilds mainly in not being stationary, and in the mystery they affected, although one resident

* The editor of this Journal by no means admits this statement.

lodge did exist in London under the title of the Freemason's Guild, afterwards merged in that of the masons. They appear to have been nothing more than peaceable artizans combining for their own safety and welfare, at a period when they could be promoted in no other way, although, thanks to the exaggerations of their friends and the calumnies of their enemies, and especially the labors of the Abbe Baruel,* — their history is now so inextricably entangled with that of the Knights of the Temple, the Rosicrucians, German Illuminati, and French Jacobins, that any clue to the true state of the case seems hopeless. When the supremacy of the laws was established, and the increased demand for builders enabled them to find permanent employment in their respective neighborhoods, the necessity for the institution ceased, and it lost its original character. These societies, strong in their principle of union, were efficient safeguards against royal as well as aristocratic tyranny. Usury also became a business, and the prodigality of the nobles made them the frequent creditors of Jews and Lombards, whose interest ate like rust into their ancient estates.

By the operation of these various causes, persons of low birth acquired wealth, together with the influence it always lends to its possessor, and with them the commercial and manufacturing interests of Europe grew into importance. But this good fortune could not, of course, be the lot of all. While a class were thus rising, the bulk of the population remained in very much the same condition in which they had found themselves at their emancipation. Merchants, manufacturers, master-workmen, professional men and wealthy farmers, now became freeholders, obtaining a degree of educa-

---

* Histoire du Jacobinisme. It would be interesting to inquire what agency this celebrated book had in the production of American Antimasonry. Hallam seems to have had a presentiment of this strong delusion, which set so many dancing after an *ignis fatuus*, to the neglect of the real evils of the country, as he remarks that the craft has undergone several persecutions, "and is perhaps reserved for still more." — (Middle Ages, ii. 299. Note.)

tion and exterior refinement, separated themselves gradually from the lower orders, and gave rise to a new estate, a middle class, equally removed in character and interests from the higher and the lower. This may be regarded as the second great social revolution, changing entirely the face of European society. The nobility no longer retained their paramount importance, being outdone in splendor, in the royal favor, and even in the struggle for office by this new power. It is this, which, under the names of *third estate* in France, and *commons* in England, claimed and received a share in the national councils, its proper representatives being the deputies of the boroughs. The annals of Europe, up to the present time, are a record of its progressive enfranchisement and aggrandisement, the tendency of nearly all the changes which have taken place being to promote and protect the accumulation of property in the hands of capitalists, and to erect an aristocracy of gold in place of that of the sword. That boasted British freedom, of which we hear so much, and which our daily familiarity with English writers has unfortunately led us to regard as a splendid reality, is freedom for the middle classes, but extending no lower. To these classes, however, we owe many of the blessings we now enjoy, — the commerce, which spreads its white sails upon all seas, the manufactures, which pour before us in such rich profusion the comforts and luxuries of life, the perfection of art, the elevation of useful science, and that energy of concentrated wealth, with the stupendous works it has achieved, — a magician's wand surpassed in its results only by that moral power of the ancient theocracies, so called, which, by the force of superstition, could gather a whole people to join in the erection of a pyramid. But our business at present is not with them, as they early lost all connexion with the lower classes.

The emancipation of the majority of the villeins was not attended by any immediate obvious change in their external condition. They were freed from the obligation to labor for any particular master, and with

this they lost the right to support from him. They had to rely solely upon the wages of such work as they could obtain, generally low and never certain. In place of mere physical oppression, they now felt the burden in other and cunninger forms, legal impositions continuing to exact what had before been extorted by the strong hand of power. The art of taxation, in its present perfected form, is one of the most remarkable phenomena of modern times, and is a legitimate offspring of the means adopted by feudal lords to procure supplies from their vassals. The royal prerogative in this respect was always exercised to its full extent, especially in England, which has in all ages been taxed beyond example. In the reign of William Rufus it was carried so far that husbandmen abandoned tillage and fled to the forests or towns, the produce of their farms being insufficient to pay the imposts and afford them a subsistence. In France also, about 1400, it became intolerable when joined to other exactions, and an eloquent preacher, Maillard, was found bold enough to denounce the purple of the rich, as dyed in the blood of the poor. After general enfranchisement and the decline of feudalism had cut off many sources of revenue, it was carried still farther, so that not only France, but all Europe presented the scene so graphically described by Carlyle;* — "the widow picking nettles for her children's dinner, and the perfumed seigneur delicately lounging in the Œil-du-Bœuf, who has an alchemy, whereby he will extract from her the third nettle, and name it rent and law!" The most oppressive monopolies were also erected, the king taking upon himself the regulation of all trade, and selling the privilege of exercising it. In the reign of Henry the Third, the records of the exchequer show that numerous towns had to pay for the liberty of dealing in dyed cloths. There are also entries of sums paid for the most ordinary purposes, as for leave to salt fish after a certain fashion. There appears indeed to have

* Chartism, p. 18.

been no limit to the royal rapacity. Justice was sold openly, the king even stipulating in prosecutions for debt, for a per-centage in case of recovery. The prerogative of purveyance was also a heavy burden, the king and after him the nobility in their order exercising a preëmption right in all markets, and paying generally their own prices. Worst of all, this privilege was extended from men's goods to their labor. By the tyrannical statute of Edward the Third, before referred to, mechanics required for the king's use might be impressed any where in the realm, were obliged to work at what wages the purveyors pleased, and, if refractory, were thrown into prison. Windsor castle and other great edifices were built in this manner. Added to all these things were the uncertainty of labor and the variable price of the necessaries of life. In agricultural districts employment was readily found during harvest, but for the rest of the year it was precarious. From the want of a regular commerce and the prevailing habits of thriftlessness, the supply of one year was often exhausted before the next year's produce could be gathered. Hence, during the earlier part of the season, when work was scarce, provisions were high, and even famine prevailed. Wheat in England was known to fall from £4 to 6s. 8d. the quarter between the beginning and end of harvest. Such an uncertain livelihood, with its alternations of abundance and want, and its irregular excitement and depression, is inconsistent with steady habits or any general well-being.

It is almost impossible to determine the precise value of wages to the laborer at any remote period, so many elements necessarily entering into the calculation. The most accurate method is, doubtless, by a comparison of the rate with the price of the ordinary means of subsistence; but this is insufficient, as all cannot be taken into the account, and much will depend upon the artificial wants of the individual. By the statute of Laborers, 11 H. 7, the diet appears to have been considered equivalent to one third of the income of an artificer, which would indicate a rather better state of

things than now generally obtains in Great Britain. But before drawing any conclusion from this fact, we should take into consideration the domestic economy of the time, of which we know but little. It is certain that the mode of life of laborers was wretched in the extreme. Even as late as the reign of Mary, their dwellings were clay-built hovels, without flooring or chimney, their beds consisting of straw, with a hard block of wood for a pillow. Nor was their fare of the character we commonly suppose. "The roast beef of Old England," so famous in song and story, doubtless did smoke upon the table of the castle, but it was a rare sight in the cottage. Antiquarians have preserved an order of Henry the Eighth, upon the steward of his household for the rations of a Lady Lucye, probably a maid of honor in waiting on the queen, from which it appears that she took five meals daily, at three of which she ate meat, and at all of which she drank ale, finish- the day with a liberal allowance of wine. At the same time, however, the ordinary diet of a ploughman was barley-bread and water-gruel. It may somewhat diminish the poetic interest we are disposed to attach to the old English harvest-home, to know that it owed its importance to the presence of cheese and mutton, articles of luxury which made its annual recurrence a holiday.

The working time was nearly the same as now, being fixed by statute at eleven hours, exclusive of meal-time. Yet even under all these adverse circumstances, the laboring community might have been in a tolerable condition, but for the unjust and absurd interference of the legislative power for their regulation. In virtue of that inherent tendency of all governments to push its operations beyond their proper limits, the English Parliament early took upon itself the control of the market of labor, specifying the rate of wages and the mode of their payment. The first famous statute of laborers, which is also the first legislative notice of the existence of a class of free workingmen, was enacted in 1350, after a dreadful plague had made great ravages

among the population, and laborers were scarce, and consequently wages high. It specifies the hire of various workmen, and fixes the price at which they shall receive grain in payment. It also commands agricultural laborers to repair to their nearest market town with their implements of husbandry in their hands, and there apply for hire in a public quarter. That of 1388 was still more oppressive, prohibiting servants from removing from one part of the country to another, and authorizing justices of the peace to fix the rate of wages every Easter and Michaelmas, by public proclamation. The most tyrannical of all was one which, if efficient, would have reduced British society to as rigid a distinction of caste as now exists in India, and which provides that no man, who does not own land of a rental of twenty shillings, shall apprentice his child to any trade or mystery, but shall bring him up to his own occupation. Sumptuary laws of the most intrusive character were also in force, fixing the quality and price of the cloth worn by the poorer classes. In the reign of Henry the Eighth no serving man was allowed to wear a coat containing more than three yards of cloth or trimmed with fur under penalty of forfeiture; and as long peaks to shoes were then in fashion, all under the degree of a gentleman were restricted to the length of eleven inches. The curfew is another instance of this annoying legislation. Such minute and troublesome regulations kept alive a constant sense of servitude on the part of the workingman, prevented all self-respect, cramped his efforts at independence, and combined with other causes to plunge him still deeper in indigence and degradation, till he frequently lost the power of obtaining a livelihood, and was obliged to resort to the desperate alternatives of robbery or alms.

Hence arose that incubus which weighs so heavily upon European communities, and is already casting its malignant shade over us, — A PAUPER POPULATION. It has been well remarked, that "the great mass of the English poor is nothing more than a continuation, under a mitigated form, of the race of villeins, who have

exchanged baronial for parochial servitude."* Forming one tenth of the entire community, they remain there, a dark body of ignorance, vice, and wretchedness, half-clad, half-fed, uncared for in soul or body, moving incessantly, like a sick giant in his agony, and consummating their misery by calling on the delirium of drunkenness to help it; an obstacle to social improvement, which might strike with despair the most sanguine philanthropist, had he no faith in the kind heavens.

Social tranquillity under these circumstances was evidently an impossibility. The people could not remain satisfied with the mere verbal admission of their freedom, when it led to no substantial amelioration of their condition, especially when notions of equality were finding their way among them. The middle class, acquiring a new interest in its wealth, lost its identity with the populace, and assumed its rank with that portion of society which is, from its position, necessarily conservative. But those below it, having as yet all to gain, made, and still are making, unceasing efforts for some more effectual improvement. Here then we may date the commencement of a new social movement; that struggle between the proletaries and richer classes which is going on around us at the present day. The earlier revolutions of Europe were, as before remarked, in favor of the middle class, as those of the Italian cities in the twelfth century. The first insurrection among, or in favor of the peasantry, was that of the serfs of Arragon, in the middle of the thirteenth century, which resulted in the establishment of a mitigated form of villeinage. About the same time there occurred another of a mixed political and religious character, in Flanders, and the north of France, but it was led on by a visionary, and disgraced by fanaticism. A little later we see all the nations of Europe disturbed by outbreakings of popular fury, sometimes in wild desperation, sometimes with remarkably rational aims, and

* Wade. History of the Middle and Working Classes, p. 27.

constituting what may be termed the great democratic movement of the fourteenth century.

It is impossible for us at present, to do more than indicate the most prominent of this important series of events. The first is the rebellion of the Swiss Cantons in 1315. Amid the rude recesses of their mountains; the hardy Swiss had learned but little of the luxury of their neighbors; great wealth was rare, and the strong line of demarcation between the various orders of the community had not been drawn. Hence all united in the effort to drive out their foreign tyrants and establish republics retaining many aristocratic features.

In 1348 occurred the first of those terrible commotions of the French peasantry, who, wearied out with oppression and stung to the quick by the insolence and rapacity of their lords, broke out in mad fury, making portions of their fair land a wilderness. They were at first styled, in derision, *Jacqueries*, and that name became a sound, which might well make the haughtiest peer of France tremble in his stronghold. They were always put down by force, and led to no results, unless it were in promoting the tendency to centralization in the government, by destroying the power of the smaller barons.

Nearly contemporaneous with this was the insurrection of the people of Flanders, produced by an attempt on the part of their Count to tax free towns against their will. The revolution of the Ciompi at Florence occurred in 1378, and deserves notice, as being the first distinct demand for universal suffrage. The government of the city had previously been in the hands of twenty-one trading companies or arts, in which a large body of the people was not represented, the inferior trades being subservient to the greater, and those who worked for daily hire being a mere mob, without any voice. The rebels took possession of the city and created two new arts for the inferior mechanics and one for the populace, so that Florence, for a short time, enjoyed that political equality which we regard as our peculiar boast.

Three years later England presented a similar spectacle in the rebellion of Wat Tyler, which originated, like most of the others, in over-taxation. In this, one knows not which to regard with most wonder, the moderation of the people or the cowardly treachery of their rulers. Their demands were just and reasonable, — the entire abolition of villeinage and freedom of trade in market-towns; — and on obtaining charters, granting these, they, for the most part, quietly dispersed. But their charters were soon revoked, and the king carried out too fully his threat; — "villeins, ye were, and are, and shall remain in bondage, not as heretofore, but incomparably more vile." This insurrection cannot, however, be considered one of villeins; for the majority of those concerned were Kentish men, among whom this condition never generally obtained. It was probably excited by those secular priests, who were born among the poor, and had still their sympathies with them, and had moreover imbibed some of the doctrines of Wicliff.

These events show how early the peasantry of Europe learned to regard their condition as unjust and oppressive, and for centuries now have they been striving with various success to better it. It would be an interesting task to trace their progress and to ascertain what they have in reality gained, but so extensive a subject would require a volume to treat it adequately. As regards their present condition, it may be remarked, that in Europe the distinction into three classes still exists, a new slavery being created by the introduction of power-manufacturing, and the state of the poor is but little ameliorated. Hallam even doubts whether their physical condition is improved at all; but admitting that they have lost in this respect, they have gained much more intellectually and morally, as well as by greater freedom for individual exertion and the means of escape from their caste.

Among ourselves, the middle and lower classes of Europe alone exist, capital and labor being placed here face to face, to see what their respective fate ultimately

shall be. Whether the grievances complained of by the laboring community are real or not, one fact is obvious; — that black, mutinous discontent prevails throughout it. The most pregnant sign of our times is perhaps the Chartist movement in England, a portion of another and older movement. Trades' Unions have taken the place of Guilds, journeymen combining against masters and masters against journeymen, instead of all uniting as formerly for the common welfare. Angry declamation is heard on all sides, and pamphlet after pamphlet is put forth with doctrines of all degrees of absurdity, showing us the mad confusion they foster. Bristol city in flames, factories blazing out at midnight, broken looms, torch meetings dispersed by armed soldiery, Glasgow operatives pronouncing their informal sentence of death upon the traitor to their cause, — these are not the indications of a healthy state.

The condition and demands of the working classes are becoming the question of questions for the British statesman, one too requiring a speedy answer, for, as has been well observed, "if something is not done, something will do itself, one day, in a fashion that will please nobody." As for ourselves, if the evil is in the bud, it yet exists and will grow. The wretchedness of Europe is gradually creeping over and will become our wretchedness. Every summer it is poured upon our shores in the shape of numerous immigrants, inferior in character to those we once received, and with diminished means of elevating themselves from their degradation. Social distinctions are annually growing wider, and it cannot be long before we hear thundering at our thresholds that all-important question, which now reaches us only across the wide Atlantic; "What shall the people do?" This was once asked in France, and Farmer-general Foulon was found ready with the reply dictated by the spirit of his olden time, of whose rapid passing away he was unconscious; — "Let the people eat grass!" — a saying which was brought to the minds of men too sternly, when the

hoary head of that first notable victim of the revolution was carried through the streets of Paris on a pike, a handful of grass thrust rudely into the mouth that had spoken that bitter taunt. Eating grass then plainly will not meet the case, for such scenes as then occurred are enough once in the history of a universe. Another answer must be found, and there can be no more fitting task for the man of clear head and courageous heart, than to tell us what it shall be. It never can be elicited by bitter complainings and threatenings on the one hand, nor by angry condemnation and reviling on the other.

In England, wide spread confusion prevails upon the subject, and every man who has been suddenly roused to its importance, like one who is awakened at midnight by the glare of conflagration, thinks he sees all with his little insight, and exclaims, Lo here! or Lo there! and all point in different directions. One sees a panacea for all social evils in an extended right of suffrage, another asserts that nothing can be done without the ballot, while others clamor for emigration, education, abolition of titles, reduction of civil list, repeal of poor-law, repeal of corn-law, — measures, some good, some bad, but none approaching the case. All this while too the danger is becoming more imminent, the excitement increasing, the burden growing heavier, the impatience fiercer and louder; so that the end seems drawing near in some undesirable crisis. Like the fabled Enceladus, this giant mass, trampled too heavily, must now make another blind effort for relief, and shake his island to the centre with convulsive struggles, breaking out into Ætna eruptions and desolating the plain with lava-streams. The same mad and maddening confusion is beginning to be heard among ourselves in the unions, combinations, strikes, and turn-outs, whereby our toil-worn brethren tell us, would we but listen, that it is not well with them. May we, profiting by the records of the past and guided by wiser councils, learn to anticipate the evil day and guard against its consequences.

Meanwhile, amid all this ominous discord, one consolatory reflection remains. This is God's world and not Satan's, and a Providence rules over it. A lie and a wrong are, by the nature of them, perishable and cannot live forever. Through all the infinitely diversified history of mankind, we can perceive that its course is still onward and upward toward a clearer and higher state. All experience, confirmed by many great and precious promises, teaches us that this progress is not ended, but must proceed to its glorious consummation in the perfection of human civilization. If then the whole frame-work of society should fall with hideous clangor around us, we need not be dismayed, for we know that it shall be reconstructed, all the firmer and the fairer. Its immortality is that of the phœnix, which requires to be consumed periodically in the flames, that it may arise to a new life, more bright and beauteous, from the smouldering ashes.

P.

Art. III. — *The Works of Charles Lamb, to which are prefixed his Letters, and a Sketch of his Life,* by Thomas Noon Talfourd, one of his Executors. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1838. 2 vols. 8vo.

Hast thou ever read the works of Charles Lamb? If thou hast, how many tender recollections start up, on the mention of his name! How in imagination dost thou again sit in mental converse with him, as to thy mind's eye he shows visibly forth, the "magnificent portals, ever gaping wide," of the South Sea House! How dost thou indulge with him, in pleasant recollections of his youthful habitation in the temple, and how dost thou stand in awe of Thomas Coventry! "whose person was a quadrate, his step massy and elephantine, his face square as the lion's, his gait peremptory and path-keeping."

Reader, — gentle reader, as he was wont to say, — if thou hast *not* read the works of Charles Lamb, how we do envy thee thy first introduction to their acquaintanceship; for much pleasure is there yet in store for thee. Get them, we beseech thee, his writings; and as thou gloriest, in noble and tender thoughts, quaint and odd conceits, clothed in a rich garb of English, "pure and undefiled," so wilt thou take his writings to thine especial keeping, and be proud of his acquaintance, as if he were the friend of thy youth.

Till quite recently the works of this elegant writer could be obtained only with great difficulty; but since his death, Sergeant Talfourd, his literary executor, has collected carefully and faithfully, all of his miscellaneous writings, and published them, together with a volume of his letters — new found treasures — and a sketch of his life affixed. This work has been republished by an American House, well known for its enterprise, and taste in selecting works for republication.

The edition published in England, and republished here, contains in the first volume the letters and life of Lamb, together with his character as sketched by his friend the Editor, and a collection of all his poems, including his two plays, "John Woodville" and "The Wife's Trial." The second volume contains his Essays of Elia; his Miscellaneous Essays and Letters under assumed signatures, as published in the different periodicals; and his Farce of Mr. H.

To Sergeant Talfourd we are much indebted, both for the justice he has done to the memory of his friend, in his able account of his life, and for the correct edition of his works, which he has given us; he has discharged the duties of an editor in a most befitting and praiseworthy manner; and in connexion with his merits as editor, we cannot forbear to make mention of his beautiful dedication to the Sister of Charles Lamb, Mary Anne Lamb, who lived, for so many years, with Charles, cherishing, fostering, and encouraging his genius; whose name should be written in letters of

gold, and whose recollection should be associated with the recollection of things pure and holy; of whom Charles never ceased to think, and to speak of in his letters, and of whom he has given so admirable a portrait in his Elia, "touching upon the foibles of his kinswoman with a gentle hand," but dilating on her virtues as a theme never to be exhausted; in a word, Bridget Elia! To this sister Mr. Talfourd has most appropriately penned this beautiful Dedication.

"TO MARY ANNE LAMB,
These Letters,
The Memorials of Many Years, which She spent with the Writer in
Undivided Affection;
of the Sorrows and the Joys She shared;
of
the Genius which She cherished,
and of
the Excellencies which She best knew,
are respectfully and affectionately Dedicated
By the Author."

Charles Lamb — we avail ourselves of Mr. Talfourd's account of his life — was born on the 18th of February, 1775, in Crown Office Row, in the Inner Temple, where he spent the first seven years of his life. His parents were in an humble station, but they were endued with sentiments, and with manners which might well become the gentlest blood; and fortune, which had denied them wealth, enabled them to bestow on their children some of the happiest intellectual advantages which wealth ever confers. On the 9th of October, 1782, at the age of seven, he was presented to the School of Christ's Hospital, by Timothy Yeates, Esq, and remained a scholar of that noble establishment till he had entered into his fifteenth year. Small of stature, delicate of frame, and constitutionally nervous and timid, he would seem unfitted to encounter the discipline of a school, formed to restrain some hundreds of lads in the heart of the metropolis, or to fight his way among them. But the sweetness of his disposition won him favor from all; and although the antique peculiarities of the school tinged his opening imagination, they did not sadden his childhood.

What Charles Lamb was when a boy, he was when grown; his oddities of manner and simplicity of thought and action, then secured to him the affection and love of his early associates; as the still stronger marked characteristics of simplicity and guilelessness of heart, strengthened the attachment of all who knew him in after years.

We are told, as in fact his writings fully attest, that he was, on leaving school, well read in the classical literature of antiquity, and that he had displayed an extraordinary aptitude of mind in the attainment of the knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages; "he had," to use the language of his biographer, "evinced considerable skill in the niceties of Latin composition both in prose and verse." This would have "secured him an exhibition," which was granted upon an understanding that the party obtaining it should enter the church; but the unfortunate impediment in his speech prevented this, and on the 23d of November, 1789, he left Christ's Hospital, and was soon after employed under his brother John in the South Sea House, till the 5th of April, 1792, when he obtained an appointment as an accountant in the East India Company. At first he received but a small salary, which he however readily contributed to the support of his mother, now bedridden, and of his father "who was sinking into dotage." He was now taken from his studies and confined to the desk, and his bright anticipations of a future spent in the pursuit of literature at the University, an employment so congenial to his mind, were forever closed, and he must drudge out his life in a mere manual occupation. In this, however, he was sensible that he was fulfilling a holy duty. In the sustaining and helping of his father and mother, in their age and sickness, and in his whole after life, so nobly devoted to his sister, he was fully conscious that he derived strength of purpose from the Great Helper, who had called him to this work, and he was therefore able to betake himself cheerfully to his task. He nobly resolved to cast aside all his former hopes, and to

tread the path set before him, with a heart lightened by a sense of rectitude, and a temper sweetened by reflection and religious confidence. How many are there, who, though not gifted with his intellect or attainments, may yet, in like circumstances, learn like him to draw sweet draughts of consolation from the fountain of duty, and like him to earn their exceeding great reward in a "mens conscia recti."

While at the Hospital, he made the acquaintance, we should rather say, the friendship of Coleridge; with whom he maintained a continual correspondence for several years. It is this correspondence in connexion with several letters written by him to Southey, Lloyd, Bernard Barton, Wordsworth, Proctor, Manning, and many others that has been given us. From these letters we shall make some few extracts, by no means as many as we could wish, for our space is limited. These letters contain some of the very finest thoughts that ever flowed from his pen. They are filled with noble and touching sentiments, while, at the same time, they sparkle with his brilliant and chaste witticisms. In these letters we have a transcript of his own mind, holding the most familiar converse with his most familiar friends. Here too do we see, that the peculiarities of "the man Elia," which are so apparent in his beautiful Essays, were but true pictures of himself, his thoughts, his actions, and his feelings. In fact, in many of these friendly communications do we find shadowed forth, sometimes dimly, and at others visibly, the very thoughts afterwards given utterance to in his Elia. Sometimes they are but sketches, afterwards more fully elaborated, and in some few instances they are even better than Elia's own musings, sweet and tender as they are.

During the year 1796–97, it was proposed that Lamb should publish his few poems in connexion with Coleridge, and with Charles Lloyd, a young gentleman to whom Coleridge had introduced him. After he had prepared his writings, he thus, in a letter to Coleridge, speaks of dedicating his portion of the volume to his sister.

"Coleridge, I love you for dedicating your poetry to Bowles, Genius of the sacred Fountain of Tears; it was he who led you gently by the hand through all this valley of weeping, showed you the dark green yew trees, and the willow shades, where by the fall of waters you might indulge an uncomplaining melancholy, a delicious regret for the past, or weave fine visions of that awful future;

"When all the vanities of life's brief day,
Oblivion's hurrying hand hath swept away,
And its sorrows at the awful blast
Of the archangel's trump are but as shadows past."

"I have another sort of dedication in my head for my few things, which I want to know if you approve of, and can insert. I mean to inscribe them to my sister. It will be unexpected and it will give her pleasure; or do you think it will look whimsical at all? As I have not spoken to her about it I can easily reject the idea. But there is a monotony in the affections, which people living together, or as we do now, very frequently seeing each other, are apt to give in to a sort of indifference in the expression of kindness for each other, which demands that we should sometimes call to our aid the trickery of surprise. Do you publish with Lloyd, or without him? In either case my little portion may come last; and after the fashion of orders to a country correspondent, I will give directions how I should like to have 'em done. The title page to stand thus—

Poems;
by
Charles Lamb, of the India House.

"Under this title the following motto, which, for want of room I put over leaf, and desire you to insert whether you like it or no. May not a gentleman choose what arms, mottoes, or armorial bearings the herald will give him leave, without consulting his republican friend who might advise him none? May not a publican put up the sign of the Saracen's Head, even though his undiscerning neighbor should prefer as more genteel the Cat and the Gridiron?

'This beauty in the blossom of my youth,
When my first fire knew no adult'rate incense,
Nor I no way to flatter but my fondness,
In the best language my true tongue could tell me,
And all the broken sighs my sick heart led me,
I sued and served. Long did I love this lady.'

Massinger.

"THE DEDICATION.

"The few following poems,
Creatures of the fancy and the feeling,
In life's more vacant hours,
Procured for the most part, by
Love in Idleness,

are,
with all a brother's fondness,
inscribed to
MARY ANNE LAMB,
The Author's best Friend and Sister.
B. 3.

"This is the pomp and paraphernalia of parting, with which I take leave of a passion which has reigned so loyally so long within me; thus, with its trappings of laureatship I fling it off, pleased and satisfied with myself that the weakness troubles me no longer. I am wedded, Coleridge, to the fortunes of my sister and my poor old father. Oh! my friend, I think sometimes, could I recall the days that are past, which among them should I choose? 'not those merrier days,' not the 'pleasant days of hope,' not those 'wanderings with a fair-haired maid,' which I have so often and feelingly regretted, but the days, Coleridge, of a *mother's* fondness for her *schoolboy.* What would I give to call her back to earth for one day, on my knees to ask her pardon for all those little asperities of temper which from time to time have given her gentle spirit pain! And the day, my friend, I trust will come. There will be time enough for kind offices of love, if Heaven's eternal years be ours. Hereafter her meek spirit shall not reproach me. Oh! my friend, cultivate the filial feelings, and let no man think himself released from the kind 'charities' of relationship; these shall give him peace at the last; these are the best foundation for every species of benevolence. I rejoice to hear by certain channels, that you, my friend, are reconciled with all your relations. 'T is the most kindly and natural species of love, and we have all the associated train of early feelings to secure its strength and perpetuity.

"Send me an account of your health; indeed I am solicitous about you.

"God love you and yours.

"C. LAMB."

Here we see how he schooled his own sweet spirit, mourned over the departure of his mother, and uttered lamentations for "asperities of temper which from time to time had given her gentle spirit pain."

In a letter to Coleridge on page 45, vol. i., we find some of the very facts and reflections set forth, which gave origin to his Essay *on a Quaker Meeting;* in this, however, he merely states a few facts, while in his Elia he has made it one of his best essays.

His poetry was published, and sometime afterwards he issued his Tale of Rosamond Gray, on which touching story we have the benefit of a most beautiful criticism from the pen of the Editor.

About the same time, that is, in 1798, upon Coleridge's departure for Germany, he commenced a correspondence with Mr. Southey, and the very first letter given us is so filled with pure, genuine fun, even to overflowing, that we are strongly tempted to give it here in *extenso*, but as there are many others equally worthy of a place, we must pass it over. We have in the very next letter a series of propositions, which Lamb tells Southey he had been tempted to propound to Coleridge by him, "to be oppugned or defended at Leipsic or Göttingen," whither Coleridge had gone. Lamb styles them "THESES QUÆDAM THEOLOGICÆ." No one can read these speculative absurdities without smiling, nay, without laughing heartily. Well were they conceived and properly addressed to him, whom Mr. Talfourd has elsewhere said, "his imagination afterwards struggled gloriously but vainly to overmaster the stupendous clouds of German philosophies." It is proper, however, to say, that they were provoked by an offer thus made by Coleridge, "Poor Lamb! if he wants any *knowledge*, let him apply to me!" Lamb thanked him and sent his "Theses."

We will here quote a letter addressed to Mr. Southey, and written shortly after the one just referred to. We give it entire, as it is published, knowing that our readers will find in it much to admire, as they will at the same time have somewhat of a transcript of Lamb's feelings, and learn his mode of doing charitable acts, unostentatiously and quietly.

"DEAR SOUTHEY,

"Your friend, John May, has formerly made kind offers to Lloyd of serving me in the India House, by the interest of his friend, Sir Francis Baring. It is not likely that I shall ever put his goodness to the test on my own account, for my prospects are very comfortable.

"But I know a man, a young man, whom he could serve through the same channel, and, I think would be disposed to serve if he were acquainted with his case. This poor fellow (whom I know just enough of to vouch for his strict integrity and worth) has lost two or three employments from illness, which he cannot regain; he was once insane, and from the distressful uncertainty of his livelihood has reason to apprehend a return of that malady. He has been for

some time dependent on a woman, whose lodger he formerly was, but who can ill afford to maintain him; and I know that on Christmas night last he actually walked about the streets all night rather than accept of her bed, which she offered him, and offered herself to sleep in the kitchen; and that in consequence of that severe cold, he is laboring under a bilious disorder, besides a depression of spirits, which incapacitates from exertion when he most needs it. For God's sake, Southey, if it does not go against you to ask favors, do it now, ask it as for me; but do not do a violence to your feelings, because he does not know of this application and will suffer no disappointment. What I meant to say was this. There are in the India House what are called *extra clerks*, not on the establishment like me, but employed in extra business, by jobs. These get about fifty pounds a year, or rather more, but never rise; a director can put in at any time a young man in this office, and it is by no means considered so great a favor as making an established clerk. He would think himself as rich as an emperor if he could get such a certain situation, and be relieved from those disquietudes, which I do fear may one day bring back his distemper. You know John May better than I do, but I know enough to believe that he is a good man. He did make me that offer I have mentioned, but you will perceive that such an offer cannot authorize me in applying for another person. But I cannot help writing to you on the subject, for the young man is perpetually before my eyes, and I shall feel it a crime not to strain all my petty interest to do him service, though I put my own delicacy to the question by so doing. I have made one other unsuccessful attempt already; at all events, I will thank you to write, for I am tormented with anxiety."

* * * * * * *

"Poor ———! I am afraid the world, and the camp, and the university have spoiled him amongst them. 'T is certain he had at one time a strong capacity of turning out something better. I knew him, and that not long since, when he had a most warm heart. I am ashamed of the indifference I have sometimes felt towards him. I think the devil is in one's heart. I am under obligations to that man for the warmest friendship and heartiest sympathy, even for an agony of sympathy expressed both by word, and deed, and tears for me, when I was in my greatest distress. But I have forgot that, as I fear he has nigh forgot the awful scenes which were before his eyes when he served the office of a comforter to me. No service was too mean or troublesome for him to perform. I can't think what but the devil, 'that old spider,' could have sucked my heart so dry of its sense of all gratitude. If he does come in your way, Southey, fail not to tell him that I retain a most affectionate remembrance of his old friendliness, and an earnest wish to resume our intercourse In this I am serious. I cannot recommend him to your society, because I am afraid whether he be quite worthy of it. But I have no right to dismiss him from *my* regard. He was at one time, and in the worst of times, my own familiar friend, and great comfort to me then. I have known him to play at cards with my father, meal-times excepted, literally all day long, in long days too, to save me

from being teased by the old man when I was not able to bear it.

"God bless him for it, and God bless you, Southey.

"C. L."

It is with no little indignation that we read, in the 65th and 66th pages of the first volume, copies of several very severe and shameful attacks made upon Lamb, in connexion with Southey and Coleridge, in the Anti-Jacobin Review. However much the editors of that periodical might have felt themselves called upon to comment upon the political opinions, or even to hold up to public ridicule and scorn the private character of Mr. Coleridge and Mr. Southey, no one for a moment can read their grossly offensive and abusive falsehoods upon Mr. Lamb, without blushing for the manhood of the authors. Comment upon their outrageous slanders would be worse than useless; they bear upon their very face the evidence of falsehood and malignity. And here a passing remark must be permitted us on the often boasted respectability of the English press, when compared with the periodical press of our own country. With some lovers of trans-Atlantic periodical literature and trans-Atlantic political opinions, (who are already too numerous in this country,) no press abounds more with scurrility of expression and bigotry of purpose than the American. Listen to them, and one would suppose, that through that great channel we only poured out filthy and unwholesome streams, tainting and infecting our political and moral atmosphere! Listen to them, and you would suppose, that the English press, free as it is in expression of opinion, was equally free from vice or corruption, and that from it came healthy and vigorous political dissertations, mingled with a pure, elegant, and philosophical spirit of morality, and that all its literary criticisms were free from pernicious sentiments, and equally free from all personal rancor or hostility. Listen, we say, and how fair they seem in their statements; *read*, we say, and how false they are, even to the apprehension of the slightest reader of the most ephemeral production. Let any one compare the two,

and he will find as much, if not more, deliberate and ungenerous slander heaped upon worthy and upright men, in these political and literary paragons, than ever was published, under the most exciting circumstances, in the strongest and warmest political journals in America, even when party fury was running mad throughout the land. Look but for a moment, at the periodical, from which emanated these vile and shameful slanders, upon this kind and generous soul; it was the organ of the high-toned tory party, professedly written for, and to express the opinions of the choice aristocracy of Great Britain, who, like our own corresponding class, arrogate to themselves all the decency, intelligence, and religion of the country; and this, their organ, directed by men, who held themselves apart from their fellows as superiors, and who catered for the refined alone, could heap the foulest abuse on a man, whose whole life was one unbroken stream of kindness towards his friends, composed of all political and religious sects, and who sacrificed the vigor of his intellect,

> "and humbly earned his bread,
> To the strict labors of the merchant's desk,
> By duty chained. Not seldom did those tasks
> Tease, and the thoughts of time so spent, depress
> His spirits; — but the recompense was high;
> Firm Independence, Bounty's rightful sire,
> Affections warm as sunshine, free as air."

And all this because he was the personal friend of Coleridge, who had been his schoolfellow, and to whom he had always looked up with admiration, as being the greatest genius of the age, and the most learned among men. We hardly need to remind our readers of the rancor of Blackwood, whenever O'Connell, Catholicity, or the present English ministry is made the subject of remark; and we some time since read an article in that journal, in which were some remarks upon the political character of Charles James Fox, that reminded us very much of the live ass kicking at the dead lion.

We will not, however, extend our remarks on this subject, being satisfied with merely entering our protest

against the spirit prevailing among some Americans to decry their own press, and more especially the democratic portion of it, that they may exalt English politico-literary periodicals.

Lamb finished his tragedy of John Woodvil, and after having submitted it to Mr. Kemble, and undergoing several vexatious and annoying delays, his hopes of witnessing its performance were disappointed by a rejection. Of this play, the editor very justly says;

> "Exhibiting the depths and not the tumults of the soul; presenting a female character of modest and retiring loveliness and noble purpose, but undistracted with any violent emotion; and developing a train of circumstances, which work out their gentle triumphs on the heart only of the hero; without stirring accident or vivid grouping of persons, it would have scarcely supplied sufficient of coarse interest to disarm the critical spirit, which it would certainly have encountered in all its bitterness."

Some time afterwards, Mr. Lamb published this play, and it was eagerly seized upon by one of the Edinburgh reviewers to furnish an article wherein the writer might display his adroitness in unfairly dissecting and ridiculing it. But it contains some of the very finest specimens of Lamb's poetical compositions. We will merely instance the passage, of which it is said, that Godwin, seeing it printed separately, came to Lamb, as one learned in old English dramatic lore, to find from him, to which of those old authors it belonged. So much did it savor of their richness and vigor. We refer to the interview between Margaret, Sir Walter Woodvil, and Simon Woodvil.

Act 2d, Scene 2d, in which Simon answers Margaret, in the lines beginning thus;

> "*Simon.*—Not many;—some few, as thus;
> To see the sun to bed, and to rise,
> Like some hot amorist, with glowing eyes,
> Bursting the lazy bands of sleep that bound him,
> With all his fires and travelling glories round him.
> Sometimes the moon on soft night clouds to rest,
> Like beauty nestling in a young man's breast,
> And all the winking stars, her handmaids, keep
> Admiring silence while those lovers sleep.
> Sometimes outstretch'd, in very idleness,
> Naught doing, saying little, thinking less,

To view the leaves, thin dancers upon air,
Go eddying round; and small birds, how they fare,
When mother Autumn fills their beaks with corn,
Filch'd from the careless Amalthea's horn;
And how the woods, berries, and worms, provide
Without their pains, when earth has nought beside
To answer their small wants.
To view the graceful deer come tripping by,
Then stop, and gaze, then turn, they know not why,
Like bashful younkers in society,
To mark the structure of a plant or tree,
And all fair things of earth, how fair they be."

The reader must not be satisfied with merely this passage, but rather take counsel by us, and read the whole scene, which, when he once begins, he will require no urging to do.

In a letter to Mr. Southey, on page 68, Vol. I., we have a passage intended to have been added to this play. It is a description of the youthful feats of John Woodvil, as a soldier in the king's armies, against the Parliament-men. This passage is not to be found in the play as printed, spirited and beautiful as it is, and to Mr. Talfourd's introduction of this letter we owe our knowledge of it. The lines were to have been spoken by Sir Walter Woodvil, — the father of John, — he being a parliament-man.

"I saw him in the Worcester fight,
Whither he came at twice seven years,
Under the discipline of the Lord Falkland,
(His uncle by the mother's side,
Who gave his youthful politics a bent
Quite from the principles of his father's house.)
Then did I see this valiant Lamb of Mars,
This sprig of honor, this unbearded John,
This veteran in green years, this sprout, this Woodvil,
(With dreadless ease guiding a fire-hot steed,
Which seemed to scorn the manage of a boy,)
Prick forth with such a mirth into the field,
To mingle rivalship and acts of war,
Even with the sinewy masters of the art,
You would have thought the work of blood had been
A play-game merely, and the rabid Mars
Had put his harmful, hostile nature off,
To instruct raw youth in images of war,
And practice of the unedged player's foils.
The rough, fanatic, and blood-practised soldiery,

Seeing such hope and virtue in the boy,
Disclosed their ranks, to let him pass unhurt,
Checking their swords' uncivil injuries,
As loath to mar the curious workmanship
Of Valor's beauty portrayed in his face."

From 1801, when this play was published, up to the time of the establishment of the London Magazine, Lamb was employed occasionally in writing, and produced his Farce of Mr. H., and several essays; but upon the establishment of that periodical under the control of Mr. John Scott, he issued his Essays of Elia, his crowning work. Of the character of these essays, it would be superfluous to speak, for who is there, that has not read and admired them?

To select from them specimens, as worthy of particular notice, would be a hard task, inasmuch as they all partake of the same beautiful and chaste spirit. Shall we quote from St. Valentine's Day? — of which, by-the-by, Mr. N. P. Willis has said, that it did not belong to Lamb, — and which assertion, we are glad to see, has here proven to be an error, since Mr. Talfourd has incorporated as his, this, — to our taste, — most elegant of his Elias, that is, if one could be *most* elegant. Turn to it, reader, and in imagination clap thy hands, and exult with the maiden who received the "'Godsend' from E. B. Valentine, wrought by the said kind E. B. with curious designs from poets older than Ovid."

"'Good morrow to my Valentine,' sings poor Ophelia, and no better wish, but with better auspices, we wish to all faithful lovers, who are not too wise to despise old legends, but are content to rank themselves humble diocesans of old Bishop Valentine and his true church."

Or shall we refer to his Chapter on Ears, wherein he sets forth most curiously and quaintly, how it was music, (such music as we are accustomed to hear at our oratorios and concerts,) affected him, how little of relish he had "to be exposed to a battery of mere sounds; to be long a dying; to be stretched upon a rack of roses; to keep up languor by unintermitted effort; to pile honey upon sugar, and sugar upon honey." And then how his soul "lay prostrate" when at the house of his Cath-

olic friend, who, with his organ, "converted his drawing-room into a chapel, his week-days into Sundays, and these latter into minor heavens." And how, when some sweet anthem, dimly recollected from childhood, while wandering in the aisles of the abbey, raised his spirit above this earth, and made it a companion of things holy.

These we may refer to; but many others, indeed, all, command our especial reading; and whether in mirth or in sadness, in joy or in sorrow, they all lead us to love and honor the author, — all take hold of our affections. There is not one, but is worthy of close reading, and long recollection. But we would refer our readers to those essays, bearing more especially upon himself, upon the "Man Elia" and his sister, Bridget Elia; for from these may we learn much more of his character, and his feelings, than we could gain from all the dissertations, written by his most intimate friends, and written, too, with the greatest nicety and elegance. Of these, take his description of his sister, in his "Mackey End," and where can be found one more graphic than that, which he there gives of that worthy woman? There has he affectionately recorded her virtues, and wittily, though with a "gentle hand," touched upon her foibles. There have we a perfect transcript of their life of double-singleness and mutual devotion. Then take his "Old China," and listen to the imaginary bewailings of his sister over their now fortunate condition; how with increase of fortune, they had lost their relish for enjoyments, which, when poor, yielded them never-failing pleasure. Read this, and you will have before you a vivid picture of the worthy man and his worthy sister.

Many are the passages we could turn to, filled with his unconscious sketches of himself; but we refrain, rather leaving it to thyself, O reader! to wander, as thou must, with delight, amidst the realities of his creation, for they are realities; even though they be created by him, they are present with thee, and known to thee, all, all of which he has written, and not mere

speculative beings, mere creatures of the fancy, dimly seen and imperfectly understood.

In the year 1825, he was permitted by the East India Company to retire upon a pension, and thus at length obtained that ease and quiet he had longed for. From this time until his death, he was engaged in occasionally writing, for different periodicals, and in enjoying the society of his numerous friends. He, however, learned, as his letters fully attest, that ease did not follow of course upon his freedom from employment. His usual occupation he missed, and for some time after the novelty of the change had worn off, he was quite miserable. His feelings upon the subject he has recorded in his "Superannuated Man." This, however, gradually wore away, and he became reconciled to this new course of life, which was now beguiled by social and literary employments.

In December, 1834, while taking his morning walk on the London road, he stumbled against a stone, fell, and slightly injured his face. He was apparently recovering, and his wounds were healing, when an erysipelas in the head came on, and he gradually but without pain, sank beneath it.

We here close our brief sketch of this amiable and gifted spirit. It has been far from our purpose to give our readers a full-length portrait of the man, or anything like an extended review of his writings. We have merely wished to record our love and admiration of his quiet, unobtrusive genius, and to contribute our mite, in our own way, towards drawing the attention of our readers generally to his peculiar merits. Charles Lamb was not a great man, as the world esteems greatness; he filled no conspicuous sphere in the world of action; he brought forward no great, new, or startling theories, assumed never the attitude of a world-reformer, and yet in his quiet pathos, in his quaint humor, in his power over the gentler and tenderer emotions of the human heart, he was great, and worthy of reverence. They, who quietly address themselves to the human heart, who awaken in us kind feelings, sweeten our

tempers, soften our affections, and smooth away the asperities of private and every-day life, are among the most efficient reformers of their age, and benefactors of their race. Among these Charles Lamb holds a high, an enviable rank. It is therefore we have wished to commend him to our readers. If we have succeeded in drawing the attention of but one reader to his merits, we shall find our reward, for we shall have thus directed one of Time's way-worn pilgrims to a never-failing spring, yielding pure and wholesome waters, refreshing the soul, strengthening the moral sense, and humanizing the heart.

B. H. B.

ART. III. — 1. *Report of the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the Bill to cede the Public Lands to the States, within whose limits they respectively lie, on certain conditions.* Made in the Senate of the United States, May 13, 1840.

2. *Speech of Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina, on the Prospective Preëmption Bill.* Senate of the United States, Jan. 12, 1841.

3. *Remarks of Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina, on the Bill to Distribute the Proceeds of the Public Lands.* Senate of the United States, Jan. 23, 1841.

4. *Speech of Mr. Benton, of Missouri, on the Prospective Preëmption Bill.* Senate of the United States, Jan. 26, 1841.

5. *Speech of Mr. Wright, of New York, on the Prospective Preëmption Bill.* Senate of the United States, Jan. 27, 1841.

6. *Speech of Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina, in Reply to the Speeches of Mr. Webster and Mr. Clay, on Mr. Crittenden's Amendment to the Preëmption Bill.* Senate of the United States, Jan. 30, 1841.

7. *Speech of Richard M. Young, of Illinois, on the Preëmption Bill, and the Proposition of Mr. Calhoun to dispose of the Public Lands to the New States, on certain conditions.* Senate of the United States, Feb. 1, 1841.

The subject of the public lands and their proceeds, brought to our especial notice in the very able Report and Speeches we have enumerated, is one of grave importance, and deserving the serious consideration of every American citizen. On the decision respecting it, to which Congress shall ultimately come, it is, perhaps, not too much to say, depends the purity, the utility, if not the very existence of the Federal Government.

While we are writing this article, it is rumored that an extra session of Congress is to be called at an early day; if so, the subject before us can hardly fail to be one of the first and weightiest, that will claim its attention. No apology, then, is needed from us to our readers, for devoting, at this time, some considerable space in our pages to its free and full discussion.

The subject itself naturally branches off into two distinct inquiries, each of which needs a separate answer: 1. What disposition shall be made of the public lands lying within the limits of the new States? 2. What disposition shall be made of the proceeds of the sale of the public lands? We shall confine ourselves, for the present, to the second inquiry.

Hitherto, the proceeds of the sale of public lands have gone into the Treasury in like manner as the proceeds of the customs, and been applied indiscriminately with the revenues derived from other sources, to any of the wants of the government. But it is now proposed to discriminate between revenue derived from the sales of land, and revenue derived from other sources; and while the last may, as heretofore, be used to meet the demands on the Treasury, the other must be reserved as a fund for distribution among the several States. In other words, it is proposed to distribute the nett proceeds of the sale of public lands among the several

States, in the ratio of their representation in Congress. This is what is called the policy of Distribution.

In considering this proposed policy of distribution, it is very natural to inquire, if there ever have been, or if there are likely to be, for some time to come, at least, any nett proceeds of the sale of public lands to distribute? The proposition is to distribute *nett* proceeds, and it can take effect only in case that there are nett proceeds. There can be nett proceeds only on the condition, that the receipts from the sale of the public lands exceed the expenditures of the government on their account.

Now, in point of fact, the public lands, thus far, have proved a dead loss to the United States. They have expended, on account of these lands, nearly nineteen millions of dollars over and above the gross receipts from their sale. According to Mr. Wright's speech, which may be relied on, for he copies from official records, the whole actual cost of the public lands to the government, up to the 30th of September, 1839, — excluding the expenses of various Indian wars, which have grown out of treaties for their purchase, and the execution of them by the removal of the Indians, — was one hundred thirty-five millions, fifty-five thousand, two hundred and twenty-five dollars and four cents; while the gross receipts of money for the sale of land up to the same date amounted to only one hundred sixteen millions, one hundred ninety-eight thousand, one hundred and seventy-nine dollars and fifteen cents; leaving, as will be seen, a balance against the lands in favor of the Treasury of eighteen millions, eight hundred fifty-seven thousand, and forty-five dollars, and eighty-nine cents. This shows, that the government has expended more than it has received. Till this excess of expenditure is reimbursed by the receipts from the sale of the public lands, there can be no *nett* proceeds. It would seem, then, to be somewhat idle to talk of the distribution of nett proceeds among the several States, at least for the present.

But, waiving this fact, conclusive, in our judgment,

it is by no means impertinent to ask, would Congress have a right, in case there were nett proceeds, to distribute them among the several States?

No man, we presume, whatever the complexion of his politics, will contend, that Congress has a right to lay and collect taxes for the express purpose of distribution. The taxing power of Congress is limited. The constitution merely gives it "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States." Congress may, of course, contract debts, but only for constitutional objects. Consequently, its taxing power is restricted to raising the amount of revenue necessary for discharging the constitutional functions of the government. Every cent of money collected from the people beyond this, in whatever shape, or under whatever pretence it may be taken, is wrongfully, unconstitutionally taken.

Now, if Congress has no right to lay and collect taxes expressly for the purpose of distribution, can it have the right to lay and collect taxes for the purpose of buying land, with a view to selling the land and distributing its proceeds? Why may it not just as well distribute the revenue it has collected, before it has been invested in the land, as after it has returned into the Treasury from the sale of the land? Where is the difference? We can see none in principle. We conclude, therefore, that if Congress has not, as it unquestionably has not, the right to raise a revenue for distribution, it can have no right to raise a revenue, invest it in land, then sell the land, and distribute the proceeds.

But all the public lands, to which the Indian title is extinguished, that is to say, all the *land* actually owned by the United States, and from which money can come into the Treasury, have been bought by the United States, and paid for out of the Federal Treasury, and of course out of funds collected from the people by taxation, direct or indirect. These public lands, then, are only the peculiar shape, in which a given amount of the revenue, raised by taxation, now exists. What,

then, is distributing the proceeds of their sale, but distributing revenue itself? What is it, in reality, but taxing the people for the purpose of raising funds to be distributed in largesses among the several States? Is the distribution of largesses among the several States, among the objects, for which Congress has a constitutional right "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises?"

If we take the ground, that these public lands are not revenue, then, we deny the right of the Federal Government to purchase them, and vitiate its whole past proceedings in regard to them. The purchase of land, beyond what is necessary for public uses, is not one of the objects, for which Congress has a right to lay and collect taxes. The Federal Government can constitutionally justify its appropriations of the funds of the Treasury to the purchase of these lands, only on the ground, that the funds so appropriated do not cease to be revenue, are not placed beyond the reach of application to the objects, for which Congress has the right to tax the people. These public lands, then, if rightfully held, are nothing but revenue, the form, more or less available, in which the government has, wisely or unwisely, seen proper to invest a portion of its income. This admitted, it follows, as a matter of course, that the same law must govern the disposition of them or their proceeds, that would govern the appropriation of any of the other resources of the Treasury.

Admit, then, that there are, — as there are not, — nett proceeds; they belong to the same proprietor, to whom belonged the revenues invested, to the proprietor of the funds, with which the lands were purchased. The lands were purchased with the funds of the United States, in their united, federal character. The United States, in this character, furnish the funds, make the investment, transact the whole concern on their own account, are liable for the losses; and are they not, then, alone entitled to the profits? If so, Congress has no right to appropriate the profits to any other objects than those, to which it might have appropriated the taxes, from which these profits are mediately derived.

On the ground which we have assumed, namely, that the public lands have been bought by the United States, and paid for with the funds of the Federal Treasury, which funds were collected from the people by taxation, there is no escaping our conclusion, that they and their proceeds are revenue, and, therefore, applicable only to objects, for which Congress has a constitutional right to raise a revenue. Distribution among the States is not one of these objects; consequently the policy of distribution of the proceeds of the public lands is unconstitutional, and ought not to be entertained. But the advocates of the policy assume a different ground. They contend, in substance, that the United States, in their federal, united character, are not the owner, but the trustee of the public lands, holding them in trust, 1. For the payment of the public debt, incurred by the war of the Revolution, and 2. For the benefit of the several States, in their separate, individual character. The debt being now paid off, they contend, that the several States have a right to demand that the nett proceeds of the lands, held for their individual benefit, be distributed among them according to the ratio of their representation in Congress. Is this ground tenable?

The position, here assumed, is, to say the least, not tenable against the whole public domain, but, if at all, only against that portion which was originally ceded to the Union by particular States. All that portion of the public domain included in the Territories of Iowa and Florida, all lying west of the Mississippi, in the States of Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana, and in the States of Mississippi and Alabama, south of the thirty-first degree of north latitude, and which is by far the larger portion, is without the limits of the territory ceded by particular States, and has been acquired by purchase from France and Spain, and the Indian tribes, and paid for out of the Federal Treasury, with the funds of the United States. This portion is, of course, owned by the United States, so far as owned at all, and not by the individual States. It, then, cannot be held in trust for the purposes alleged.

The other portion of the public lands was ceded to the Union by particular States; but these States did not convey a clear title to the land. They ceded, so far as the present question is concerned, only the right to purchase the land of the Indian tribes, who were its acknowledged owners. Now, the federal government, so far as the Indian title does not yet remain unextinguished, has bought these lands and paid for them with the funds of the United States. It holds them by virtue of purchase from the Indian tribes, and not by virtue of State cession. The United States have bought them, and paid for them with their own funds; and why do they not own them, as much as a man owns his farm, for which he has paid, and received a legally executed deed? So far as concerns the proceeds of lands sold, we can see, then, no more claim the individual States can have to them in the case of this portion of the public domain, than in the case of the other.

But admit, that the particular States making cessions, did convey a clear title to the land, as well as the right to purchase, still the claims of the individual States are invalid, because they ceded their original claims to the United States for the *common* benefit of all the States, and not for their separate, or individual benefit. Congress, in their resolution of the 10th of October, 1780, declare "that the unappropriated lands, which may be ceded to the United States by any particular State, shall be disposed of for the *common* benefit of the United States." New York, in the act of her legislature, authorizing her delegates in Congress to cede to the United States her claims to the western territory, enacts, that the lands so ceded, "shall be and enure to the use and benefit of such of the United States as shall become members of the federal alliance of the said States, and for no other purpose whatsoever;" and in her deed of cession, she "cedes, transfers, and forever relinquishes to, and *for the only use and benefit* of such of the States as are, or as shall become, parties to the articles of confederation; all her right, title, jurisdiction, and claim" to the lands in question.

Virginia insisted upon a guaranty from Congress, that the lands ceded should be disposed of for the "common benefit" of all the States, which were, or which should become members of the confederation, or federal alliance; and it was in consideration of the fact, that "Congress, by their act of 6th September, 1780, did recommend to the several States of the Union, having claims to waste and unappropriated lands in the western country, a liberal cession to the United States of a portion of their respective claims, for the *common* benefit of the Union," and in the belief that Congress would continue "earnestly to press upon other States, claiming large tracts of waste and uncultivated territory, the propriety of making cessions equally liberal for the *common benefit and support of the Union*," that she finally consented to make her cession. And in her deed of cession she stipulates,

"That all the lands within the territory so ceded to the United States, shall be considered a *common* fund, for the use and benefit of such of the United States as have become, or shall become, members of the Confederation, or federal alliance of the said States, Virginia inclusive, according to their usual respective proportions in the *general* charge and expenditure, and shall be faithfully and *bona fide* disposed of for that purpose, and for no other use or purpose whatsoever."

The other States follow the same principle, and cede their claims for the same purpose; that is, that these lands may be a "common fund" for the use and benefit of all the members of the confederation, or federal alliance of the States. This would seem to be enough. The lands were ceded to the United States, to constitute a "common fund" for their use and benefit. Language could not be more explicit; and if we recur to the circumstances, under which the cessions were made, we shall be satisfied, that more explicit language could not be desired. All these cessions, with the exception of those made by North Carolina and Georgia, and cessions, from which nothing has been derived to the Treasury, were made before the adoption of the present Constitution, under the old articles of confederation. Under the articles of confederation, Congress

had no fixed revenue, or at least none to answer its wants. It did not assess, as the Federal Government may now, its taxes directly on the people of the several States. It merely determined on the amount of money it needed, and made its requisitions on the several States, leaving it to the States to raise their respective quotas in their own way, by impost, direct taxation, or loan, as they saw proper.

Now, the States which had, as individual States, no claim to these waste and unappropriated lands, desired them to be ceded to the Union, as a common fund to meet, as far as they would go, *these requisitions made by Congress* on the several States. They did not ask the cession, as affording a fund for defraying their own peculiar expenses, expenses incurred in their character of individual States, but to meet those expenses, which they incurred as members of the confederation, that is, to meet the expenses, not of the separate States, but of the United States.

If we examine attentively the Virginia deed of cession, we shall see that it was drawn up expressly to meet this view of the case. Virginia, in the first place, stipulates that it "shall be a *common* fund for the use and benefit of such of the United States as have become, or shall become, members of the Confederation or federal alliance of said States." Then, to prevent all cavil, she further stipulates, that it shall be a common fund, to be apportioned out to each State, according to its "usual proportion in the general charge and expenditure." This last stipulation, at that time, had a meaning, which, by the adoption of the Federal Constitution, it has not now; but it affords additional evidence, that the intent of Virginia was, that the lands ceded should be for the use and benefit of all the States in meeting this "general charge and expenditure," that is to say, the charge and expenditure of the Union; and, therefore, she stipulates that it shall be placed to the credit of each State, according to its proportion of that charge and expenditure. This was precisely what the States, making no individual claim to the western territory, demanded.

Maryland, New Jersey, and the other States, having no individual claims to this western territory, regarded these lands, which the other States claimed and subsequently ceded to the Union, as "crown lands," a part of the royal domain, and, therefore, after the Revolution, as vesting in the United States. The legislature of New Jersey, in their remonstrance to Congress against the exclusive pretensions of Virginia, say, "we cannot be silent, while viewing one State aggrandizing herself by the unjust detention of that property, which has been procured by the *common* blood and treasure of the whole, and which, on every principle of reason and justice, is *vested in Congress for the use and general benefit of the Union they represent.*" The same doctrine was put forth, and still more strenuously urged, by Maryland. The legislature of New York, in the act already referred to, assign, as a reason for authorizing the cession of her claims to the lands in question, the fact, that "it is conceived that they ought to be appropriated as a *common fund* for the expenses of the war." Mr. Madison, in his correspondence, as we have it in the Madison Papers, everywhere speaks of the cession to be made, as a cession to be made "for the common benefit." These facts, taken in connexion with the language used in the deeds of cession, render it absolutely certain, that the lands were ceded as a "common fund" for meeting the expenses of the United States, incurred in their united character, not as a fund to be divided among the States for defraying expenses incurred in their individual character.

It follows from this, that so far as the United States hold these lands under the deeds of cession executed by particular States, they hold them for the common use and benefit of all the States, and are bound to apply their proceeds to the expenses of the States, incurred in their united, federal character. *They were ceded to the Union for the express purpose of contributing towards a permanent revenue for the Union.* Congress has, then, no right to appropriate their proceeds to any other purpose. Taking these lands, then, and following the

deeds of cession, and allowing them to be all that the advocates of distribution contend, we are still obliged to regard them as revenue, revenue of the Union, and applicable to no purposes, except those for which, as we have said before, Congress has the constitutional right to raise a revenue.

The next position assumed by the advocates of distribution is, that these lands were ceded to the Union for the purpose of paying the debt incurred by the war of the Revolution ; and as that debt is now paid off, they, in equity at least, revert to the States individually. But, admitting this was the purpose, for which they were ceded, the reversion can be only of the claims which were ceded, that is to say, of the right to purchase. The property in the *land* cannot revert, for this property does not vest in the United States by virtue of State cession, but of the deeds executed by the Indian tribes, of whom the United States have purchased them with the funds of the Union. The cession, moreover, was entire, and forever, of all the right, title, jurisdiction, and *claim* of the ceding States. There is nothing in the deeds of cession, on which to found a claim of reversion. Nor is there, in the history of the times, anything that shows, that such was the understanding of the States making, or of the United States accepting, the cessions.

Furthermore, the lands were not ceded for the express purpose of paying the debt of the Revolution, nor any other specific debt. They were ceded for the general purposes of revenue, which revenue might be applied to the extinguishment of the public debt, or to any of the legitimate purposes, for which Congress might raise money. It was believed at the time, that these lands might be made a source of revenue to the Union, and this was the ground, on which the States not claiming them in their separate right, demanded their assumption by the Union, or their cession to it. This point we have already established. Maryland would not ratify the articles of confederation till the cession of New York gave assurance, that the western territory

would become a common fund for the benefit of all the members of the federal alliance. The territory was ceded for the general purposes of revenue; but as the public debt was then the great concern of the government, there can be little doubt, that it was hoped that its cession to the Union would contribute something towards extinguishing that debt; at least, towards paying the interest annually accruing on it; or, what is still more evident, that the cession would inspire public creditors with confidence in the ultimate ability of the United States to meet all demands against them.

But, admit the lands were ceded to the Union to pay the public debt incurred by the war of the Revolution. We ask, which debt? The debt incurred by the United States, or by the individual States? Each State incurred a debt of its own in that war, besides the debt it incurred as a member of the Union. There was a United States debt, and a debt of the individual States. These lands, we do not find were ceded to pay these individual State debts, but, if any, the debts of the United States. This is rendered evident by the fact, that both Virginia and Georgia stipulated, as conditions of their respective cessions, that Congress should reimburse them certain expenditures they had made on account of these lands, in defending them against the Brrtish and Indians. If the cessions had been made for the purpose of extinguishing the State debts, these stipulations would hardly have been necessary. They were ceded, then, to meet the general expenses, and to help discharge the common debt. This, again, confirms the ground we have taken, that their cession was for the common benefit, and renders it obligatory on Congress to appropriate their proceeds to the use of the States in their united capacity, not in their individual.

Moreover, though these lands were unquestionably ceded, as they were solicited, as a fund for the common use and benefit of all the States united, and, therefore, capable of being applied to any of the purposes, for which Congress might lay and collect taxes, and to no others, yet there were other reasons, which had their

influence. The States, which had no claim in their separate right to these lands, were jealous of the States which had. The claims of one State, also, conflicted with those of another. The claims of New York were thought to cover all the territory claimed by Virginia, and the deeds of cession executed by New York and Massachusetts cover the same identical territory. Back of all these was the claim of the United States, which was considered by several of the States as preferable to that of any of the particular States. How were these conflicting claims to be adjusted, and the jealousies and heart-burnings growing out of them to be allayed? Evidently, the most feasible way was for the particular States to cede their claims to the Union, under guaranty that they should be disposed of for the common benefit of all the members of the federal alliance. It was on this ground, that New York passed the act to which we have referred, an act which she entitled "an act to facilitate the completion of the articles of confederation and perpetual union among the United States of America." On this ground, too, Congress resolved, on the 6th of September, 1780, "that it be earnestly recommended to those States, who have claims to the western country, to pass such laws, and to give their delegates in Congress such powers, as may effectually remove the only obstacle to a final ratification of the articles of confederation."

But, granting all that the advocates of distribution contend for, it will avail them nothing. They say these lands were ceded to the Union for the payment of the debt incurred by the war of the Revolution. Be it so. But, these nett proceeds must equal the amount of that debt before there can be, on the part of the States, any claim to reversion.

Now these lands have not, as yet, contributed one cent toward the payment of that debt. Taking the lands ceded by the particular States to the Union, and they are still in debt to the Union. The Union has never derived a cent of clear income from them. The expense of extinguishing the Indian title, surveying,

bringing them into market, and disposing of them, had exceeded, according to Mr. Wright's statement, on the 30th of September, 1839, the gross amount of receipts from their sales, one million, one hundred seven thousand, two hundred and six dollars, and thirty-nine cents. Where is the reversion of remainder to the states? There is, as yet, no remainder. There can be none on the principles assumed by the advocates of distribution, till this one million and over is wiped off; nay, not till the nett receipts of these lands shall have reimbursed the Union all that it has paid on account of the debt of the Revolution, for which, it is said, they were held in trust.

We go a step further. We not only say, that the ceded territory never has contributed a cent towards paying the debt, for which, it is alleged, they were ceded to the Union; but we say, that under no circumstances can they reimburse the Union for what it has paid on account of that debt. The debt of the United States, at the conclusion of the revolutionary war, in 1783, as near as could be ascertained, was forty-two millions, three hundred and seventy-five dollars, the annual interest on which was computed at two millions, four hundred fifteen thousand, nine hundred and fifty-six dollars. This would make the present value of the debt, with simple interest, one hundred eighty-two millions, one hundred twenty-five thousand, eight hundred and twenty-three dollars. This is the sum now chargeable against these lands, and which they must reimburse, before the States can have any claim to a distribution of their proceeds, on the principle contended for. We will, however, abate the interest, and take the debt as it stood in 1783, that is, at forty-two millions, three hundred and seventy-five dollars.

The whole amount of land ceded to the Union by particular States, from which money could come into the Treasury, according to Mr. Wright's table, was two hundred two millions, four hundred sixty-six thousand, seven hundred and sixty-five acres; of which there remain now, "subject to sale," one hundred five millions,

eight hundred sixty-five thousand, one hundred and nineteen acres, together with twenty-six millions, nine hundred twenty-two thousand, seven hundred and thirty-one acres, to which the Indian title is not yet extinguished. The present value of this, allowing nothing for extinguishing the Indian title, and estimating the land at one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre, assuming the calculations of the committee on public lands as the basis of our estimate, cannot exceed twenty-three millions of dollars. Suppose, then, the whole of this land shall be sold, at the present government price, which it cannot be, it will discharge but about one-half of the public debt, rated at its value at the close of the war, in 1783. Whence, then, is to come a remainder, to be distributed among the several States?

But the advocates of the policy under consideration, abandoning this ground, assume another. They abandon the *right* of the States to claim a distribution, and contend only for the *power* of Congress to distribute the proceeds of the public lands among the several States, according to its own discretion. This power they deduce from that clause in the constitution, which gives to Congress power to dispose of the territory and other property of the United States. The clause in question reads;

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory, or *other property* belonging to the United States."

Does this clause give the power contended for? It will be seen at once, that it gives to Congress no power to dispose of the public domain, which it does not also give it to dispose of the *other* property of the United States. It has the same power to dispose of "the public buildings, docks and navy yards, forts, arsenals, magazines, ships of war, cannon, arms of all descriptions, naval stores, and munitions of war," that it has to dispose of the public lands. Has Congress a discretionary power over the disposal of all this immense amount of property, which, according to some estimates, cannot be less than two thousand millions of dollars? Take

the case suggested by Mr. Calhoun. Has Congress a right to select one of the religious sects of the country, "say the Methodist, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, or Catholic, and erect it into a splendid hierarchy, by endowing it out of this ample fund?" Why not? For the plain reason, that the constitution prohibits Congress from creating a religious establishment. Congress cannot, then, dispose of the public domain for objects prohibited by the constitution.

We proceed a step further. We are still borrowing from Mr. Calhoun. Would Congress, for instance, have the right to appropriate the proceeds of this territory to the Colonization Society, or the Abolition Society, in the first case, with a view of christianizing and civilizing Africa, and in the last case, with a view of emancipating the negro slaves? Here are great objects, and good objects, in the judgment of not a few. Why has not Congress a right to make appropriations for their furtherance? Simply, because the constitution gives it no express grant of power for that purpose. Here, then, is another restriction on the discretionary power of Congress. It can, in the first place, dispose of the property of the United States for no objects prohibited by the constitution; and, in the second place, for no objects which the Constitution does not expressly grant it power to make appropriations for.

This follows, from the very nature of the Federal Government, which is one not of general, but of special powers. The constitution is the enumeration, rather than a limitation of its powers. The government is not free to exercise all the powers of government not expressly prohibited; but it is prohibited from exercising all powers not expressly granted, specified, enumerated. It is not enough, that there is in the constitution no express clause against the measure proposed, but there must be an express clause in its favor, before Congress can have a constitutional right to adopt it. This is the only safe rule of construing the constitution. The conclusion we have drawn, then, is inevitable. The discretionary power of Congress over the territory of the

United States is subject to the two limitations we have stated. It may unquestionably dispose of that territory, but for *no object prohibited, or not expressly authorized, by the Constitution.* It can, then, appropriate the proceeds of this territory only to constitutional objects, — objects, for which it has a constitutional right to make appropriations from the Treasury. Distribution among the several States is confessedly not one of these objects; consequently, Congress has no right to distribute the proceeds of the public lands among the several States.

This reasoning we hold unanswerable and conclusive against the constitutionality of the policy of distribution. Here, then, we might rest our case, for we presume that there is no class of men amongst us, willing, — knowingly and deliberately, — to run athwart the constitution. There is yet, we should hope, too much respect for constitutional government remaining in the breasts of the American people, to render this either feasible or safe. Nevertheless, the expediency of the policy, and especially at this time, is worth considering.

The reasons for advocating this policy are by no means recondite, nor are they reasons, which should be wholly disregarded. Several of the States, in prosecuting works of internal improvement, in endeavoring to aid their banking institutions, and the business operations of their citizens generally, have contracted large and somewhat pressing debts. Their credit is impaired; their securities are at a ruinous discount; and in some instances, absolutely unsaleable. In the complicated state of the credit system, this operates greatly to the disadvantage not only of the particular states concerned, but of business in general. The resources of the country are to a great extent locked up, and its energies crippled. If we could revive and confirm the credit of these States abroad, where the principal part of the securities are held, we should throw these securities again into the market, render them saleable without any serious loss; enable the states issuing them to go on

with their internal improvements, to complete their public works, and get the command of their resources; enable the banking institutions, whose resources are locked up in these securities, to apply their capital to the general business operations of the country, and in that way to save themselves, and the merchants dependant on them; from utter ruin, give a new spring to trade, cause business to revive, and the country to prosper.

Distribution, it is thought, will aid this result in two ways. The sum which will be distributed, — for it is proposed to distribute about three millions and a half annually to the several States, — will afford considerable relief to the embarrassed States, and enable them to meet their more pressing engagements. It will also tend to inspire confidence in the holders of State securities, as to their value and ultimate redemption. The depressed condition of these securities is owing chiefly to the loss of confidence in the ability or disposition of the States issuing them to redeem them. Restore this confidence, and they rise immediately to their par value generally, and will be sought for by all who have capital to invest, whether at home or abroad. This done, the evil is removed. The increase of ability which distribution will give to the States, and the policy it will indicate on the part of the general government in regard to the credit system of the country, it is thought will restore this confidence.

These, we suppose, are the reasons which govern the advocates of distribution. They are, of course, reasons not without weight, and which may be supposed to be urged in good faith, and with patriotic views.

We very much doubt, however, whether the result desired would follow the adoption of the contemplated policy. Our own opinion is, that the credit system has been pushed too far, that it is falling to pieces from its own inherent weakness, and that all attempts to bolster it up will prove unavailing. It is past remedy, and the prescriptions of our State physicians are merely prescriptions to a body already in the agonies of death. But

let this pass, as foreign to our present purpose. We still object to the policy, because the end sought can be obtained at a less expense in another way.

Whence has come this loss of confidence in State securities? So far as it is not the result of the inherent weakness of the system, and, therefore, so far as confidence is capable of being restored, it has come from the general persuasion, at home and abroad, that the last two administrations were at war with what is called "the credit system." This persuasion grew out of the means resorted to by the opposition to those administrations, for the purpose of breaking them down, and, perhaps, in part, from the doctrines propagated by some members of the party generally supporting them. The persuasion was, in our judgment, without any solid foundation. But let that pass. The public sentiment of the country has always been favorable to credit, always in favor of the government, whether State or Federal, keeping faith with its creditors. It is true, that the doctrine has been put forth, by here and there an individual, that State loans are unconstitutional, and that the people of the States are not bound to redeem them. But this doctrine has few disciples; and fewer still of those even, who believe in the unconstitutionality of the loans, would go so far as to recommend applying the sponge.

Several of the States, we grant, are deeply in debt; but there is no State in this Union, that has not ample resources for liquidating all its liabilities. We will also venture to say, that there is no State in this Union, that is so lost to all sense of her honor as a State, to say nothing of common honesty, as to even dream of violating her faith with the public creditor. If we believed there were such a State, were she our own mother-land, we would disavow her, and wish her blotted from the map of the Union. In saying this, we do but express the sentiment of the immense majority of the people of all the States. The American people, thank God! have yet a strong sense of justice; they have also a lofty pride of character, that would induce almost

every man to become a beggar, sooner than consent to see the government of his choice deliberately refusing to keep its faith.

Let it be once understood, — as it may be now, — that the States have within themselves, and they certainly have, the means of redeeming their obligations, and that they also have the disposition to do it, and confidence in their securities will be restored, as far as it is possible to restore it. There is now no motive for representing the Federal Government or its friends as hostile to credit, as desirous of embarrassing the business operations of the country; and we assure the holders of State securities, that they will never find a party in this country of sufficient numbers to be counted, that will advocate the non-redemption of those securities. This, clearly and distinctly understood, will have all the beneficial effect on State Bonds, that can be hoped for from distribution.

The project of complete and entire assumption of the State debts, by the Union, we presume no statesman will venture to recommend. The indirect and partial resumption, by distribution of three millions and a half, will be insufficient, and fail in its object. It will not be enough to relieve the embarrassments of the indebted States, yet these States will rely on it, and hope, by its aid, to get along, without resorting to the efficient measures required. They will adopt a temporizing policy, which will relieve no embarrassment, and inspire no confidence. The indebted States must resort to taxation. This, whatever temporary expedients they may adopt, must be resorted to at last, and everything which tends to delay the resort to this, but in reality aggravates the evil. The sooner the indebted States lay a tax on their citizens to meet their engagements, the better it will be for them, the better for all concerned. Let the State provide for its liabilities out of its own resources, and its credit will rise much more rapidly, and be placed on a much more permanent basis, than it will be by any temporary aid it may derive from distribution of the proceeds of the public lands.

But we object to this policy on another ground. The amount, which it is proposed to distribute, cannot be spared from the Federal Treasury. We are told, that there is a deficit in the revenues, a considerable public debt accumulating, and that Congress must be called together immediately, to devise, among other matters, ways and means for meeting the demands on the Treasury for the ordinary expenses of the government. Is it wise, when such is the state of our finances, already inadequate to our wants, to diminish them by gratuitously distributing nearly one-fourth of the ordinary revenue among the several States? The deficiency that will thus be occasioned can be met only by a resort to additional taxation. And the necessity of this resort to additional taxation will not grow out of the legitimate wants of the Federal Government, but out of the wants of the State governments. Why not, then, as taxation must be resorted to by one government or the other, leave it to the State governments, whose wants create the necessity? Why shall the Federal Government be compelled to assume the odious character of tax-collector for the States? Was this the purpose for which it was created? It is no mark of good statesmanship, to say the least, to create, needlessly, a necessity of resorting to taxation. If we had a surplus in the Treasury, more money than we needed, then there might be some show of propriety in distributing it among the States; but now, when we have no more than we want, and when we are even threatened with a deficiency, to distribute three millions and a half, strikes us, to say the least, as a piece of rather bungling statesmanship.

The deficiency distribution would create must be met by new imposts. It will require us to raise the tariff of duties. But this cannot be done without disturbing the tranquillity of the Union. No wise man, no friend of the Union, it seems to us, can wish to renew the painful and angry, if not dangerous discussions, on this subject, which we have so lately passed through. A tariff for protection will never again be

submitted to. Our manufactures do not need it; our commerce is opposed to it. Commerce wants freedom, and our manufactures are able to protect themselves. They are established on a permanent basis, and if left to the ingenuity and enterprise of our citizens, can compete successfully with those of the old world. There is, then, in reality, no reason for a tariff, except for revenue. The country will tolerate a tariff for no other purpose, and there is no man who dares risk his reputation by proposing one directly for protection.

But, distribute three millions and a half of revenue, create thereby a deficiency, then cannot the friends of a tariff for protection urge the imposition of new or additional duties, on the ground that they are needed for the purposes of revenue? "The Compromise Act," as it is called, is held sacred by the country; but that act recognises the propriety of raising the *ad valorem* duty, if required for the purposes of revenue. Create then, by distribution, a deficiency in the revenue, and additional duties may be imposed, without disturbing that act. This would be an ingenious way of keeping the letter of that act, while violating its spirit. Is this the secret of the policy of distribution? Is it the old tariff interest, that is at work here, attempting to do indirectly, covertly, what it wants the courage, the manliness, to attempt openly, directly? So it would seem. And yet, the advocates of distribution are high-minded and honorable men, — men who would scorn to be thought deficient in courage, moral or physical, and who would deem it gross injustice to be thought capable of attempting to carry any great measure of state policy, by management, or trickery.

But suppose the policy adopted, the deficiency created, and supplied by an increased tariff of duties; what will be the result? Connected with this policy will be another, the repeal of the Independent Treasury Law, and the establishment of a new United States Bank, or the revival, with modifications, of the "pet bank" system, — most likely, for the present, the latter. This we will suppose done, and that the whole policy

succeeds according to the calculations of its friends. The State Bonds will become saleable in the market; the banks can avail themselves of their resources; trade will revive, and business will be brisk; heavy importations will be made after the first or second year, the duties on which will be deposited in the bank or banks during the period between collection and disbursement, and made the basis of discounts. The banks, having in addition to their own capital the government deposit, will discount freely; which will have for its first effect to expand the circulation and appreciate prices. This will neutralize the good effects of the tariff on manufactures. It will also increase the profits as well as the means of importations. The second effect will be to make large additions to the amount of foreign importations. These additions will, of course, increase the revenue, and of course the amount of government deposits; and, of course, again, the ability of the banks to enlarge their discounts. This, again, will still further expand the circulation, appreciate prices still more, and, in a word, revive in all their aggravated features, the ruinous speculations of 1835 and 1836. This is the inevitable result of the policy proposed, in case it prove successful. Is this result desirable?

We know that it may be thought, that individuals and banks have learned wisdom from their past experience; but those mad speculations were not the effect of the madness of individuals, nor of banks. When prices were every day rising, who could see where to stop in his purchases to sell again? When the bank assets far exceeded its obligations, and specie was readily obtained when wanted, who could say where the bank ought to stop in its discounts? We have blamed too severely both individuals and banks for the disastrous scenes of the years alluded to. Individuals and banks were the victims of the combined operations of the tariff and paper money, aided by the immense State and corporation loans abroad, of nearly three hundred millions of dollars, all of which were paid in merchandise, imported to bloat the Treasury, and to paralyze our home

manufactures. Adopt the policy you propose, and if it succeed as you wish, it will reënact the same scenes, occasion the same mad and ruinous speculations, and make the most prudent and sagacious of our business men, and the honestest and best managed of our banking institutions, their victims. If our business men have learned wisdom from past experience, they will not seek again to put into full operation the causes that produced the calamities, from which they are now but slowly beginning to recover.

The business men, including the bankers of this country, are, in what concerns their business, as enlightened, and as honest and high-minded as those of any other country in the world. They are among the elite of our population. They are bold and adventurous; but they are also prudent and sagacious. Their failures or ill-successes are seldom, taking them as a body, owing to their personal defects, whether moral or intellectual. They fail from the false systems of finance and currency, under which they are obliged to operate. The policy, that has hitherto been pursued, is what has ruined them. Give them a sound, a uniform currency, give them an open field and fair play, and we will set them, whether in manufactures or in commerce, against the world. Let them abandon the narrow policy, which ill comports with their bold and adventurous minds, of striving to shut out other nations from the home market, and go forth the rival of all nations for the markets of the world. This is their true policy, and let them pursue it but for a short time with their usual prudence and energy, and the markets of the world are at their command. They have done nobly, under all the disadvantages they have had to struggle with. What could they not do with those disadvantages, those ruinous clogs on their enterprise, removed?

Commerce and manufactures are the two leading interests of the world, the great civilizers of the race. They have been the principal agents in raising the nations from primitive barbarism; and if, in looking over the map of the earth, one spot strikes us as more luminous

than another, it is the spot where commerce and manufactures have had their seat. In the ancient world the rays of light centre on the commercial republics of Phenicia, Carthage, Greece, and her colonies, and as you recede from these, you retire into darkness. They are and must be great and leading interests of this country; they are to make this country what it will be, and to give it its rank among the nations of the earth. He, who is hostile to them, is hostile to his country, nay, to his race, the enemy of freedom and civilization. In opposing the policy under consideration, we oppose not them; we but oppose a policy which they need not, and which must ever prove disastrous to them.

We also oppose the policy in question, because at this time there is a peculiar need of husbanding all the resources of the Treasury to put our country in that attitude of defence, which our foreign relations render imperiously necessary. We are neither advocates nor prophets of war; we do not seriously apprehend that there will be any war at present, in which this country will be involved. Commerce has so spread her meshes over the world, so interwoven the interests of one nation with those of another, that war every day becomes more and more difficult. Still the era of peace has yet to dawn on the world, and the time, when it is no longer necessary to prepare for war, has not yet come. Our relations with Great Britain at this moment are by no means of the most friendly nature. We have grievous wrongs to complain of, and difficulties to adjust, that will not be easily adjusted. We can never yield to her claims on our Northeastern Boundary. We cannot adjust those claims, as some suppose, by accepting an equivalent for the territory she demands. We cannot give her the immense advantage, in case of a war with this country, of a military road from Halifax to Quebec, an advantage equivalent to an army of some thirty or forty thousand men. We can never yield to her encroachments on our Northwestern frontier, for our territory must be retained entire. We can never consent, that the violation of our territory in a time of peace, by

an armed force, as in the case of the Caroline, shall pass without redress, for we are an independent nation; nor can we submit to the right of search, and the seizure of our vessels on the coast of Africa, or the high seas, under any pretence whatever. Our flag must protect our commerce, and our ships. Here are matters, which bring us into direct conflict with Great Britain, and will inevitably lead to a war with that power, unless we show, by our firmness, by our military and naval preparations, that we are both able and determined to maintain our rights. If we would escape the calamities of war, we must be prepared for it.

Our country is confessedly almost entirely without defence. Our inland defences can be of little use in any new war, and our seaboard is unprotected, and liable, at any moment, to be laid under contribution by British steamers. Is it wise, then, at this juncture, to reduce the resources of the Treasury by distributing three millions and a half of the revenue among the States? Is it wise, when we are likely to want all the money that we have, and when the people must tax themselves all they can bear, for the purposes of defending our coast, and protecting our navigation, to throw away so large a portion of our resources? We need all the money that we can raise from the customs, and from land, too, to protect our country, and to put it in an attitude to assert and maintain its rights and interests. If, then, Congress had the power, as we have shown that it has not, to distribute the proceeds of the public lands among the several States, it would be inexpedient, and highly impolitic to do it. Congress is called upon to appropriate the resources of the Treasury to higher and more urgent objects, and as much as we sympathize with the depressed condition of the indebted States, true policy, as well as constitutional right, requires us to leave them to their own resources, which we cannot and will not believe will prove insufficient.

We here close what we have thought proper to say on the first branch of this subject. For a further discussion of it, we refer our readers to the Speeches enu-

merated at the head of this article, especially to those of Mr. Wright and Mr. Calhoun, to which we with pleasure acknowledge ourselves indebted for no small part of the materials, which give to this article what little value it may have.

The consideration of the other branch of the subject, namely, the disposition which ought to be made of the public lands lying within the limits of the new States, we are reluctantly compelled to postpone to a future occasion.

EDITOR.

ART. V. — LITERARY NOTICES.

Night and Morning. A Novel. By BULWER. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1841. 2 vols. 12mo, — We have heretofore given at length our views of the general merits of Bulwer, as a writer and a novelist. He deservedly enjoys a high reputation, and is not likely to send forth a work, that will not be sought after with avidity, and read with interest, if not with approbation. Yet this last work of his, we do not think will add anything to his fame. In its good points, the author merely repeats himself, and where he does not repeat himself, he falls below himself in his other works.

The story, however, is not without its interest, and it is conducted with considerable art and adroitness, though not always. Its plot is very simple. Philip Beauport, the heir expectant of an old house, wealthy but not noble, falls in love with Catharine Morton, whom he privately marries, and with whom he lives some fifteen or sixteen years without any serious falling out. The marriage, in order not to exasperate the old uncle, from whom the inheritance is expected, is kept secret, the witnesses are removed, and the impression suffered to be entertained, that the parties are living together illicitly, and that their children, of which there are two, sons both, are illegitimate. But at length the old uncle dies, as rich old uncles sometimes will die, however loth they may be to die, and bequeaths his estate as was hoped. Philip Beaufort is now a rich man, and being not a bad sort of a man, and loving his wife as husbands have now and then been known to do, and having no farther occasion to conceal his marriage, and not caring for the trouble of going through a new courtship, resolves to own his marriage, and publicly avow the mother of his children as his "lawfully wedded wife." But before he gets ready to perform this tardy act of justice, he breaks his neck in at-

tempting to leap a six-barred gate. A younger brother succeeds to the inheritance, and his wife and her two sons, unable to prove their legitimacy, are thrown upon the world destitute and branded with infamy. The novel is designed mainly to trace the fortunes of this mother and her two sons, till she dies, and they are reëstablished in their rights, and duly married. In the progress of the story we are led through scenes of misery, abject wretchedness, crime, vice, clean and unclean, vulgar and polite, to our heart's content, nay, to a surfeit.

Of the characters introduced, not much need be said; they are Bulwer's old set, without whom we should neither recognise him, nor he recognise himself. We have the hero so, so, the bold, daring, virtuous criminal, the cool, calculating voluptuary, the pure, beautiful, simple, affectionate lady, and so on. Philip Beaufort the younger, is the hero. He is proud, irascible, but strong and persevering. He is loaded with adversity, apparently for the purpose of humbling his pride, and teaching him forgiveness; but he succeeds indifferently, till a silly Frenchwoman falls in love with him, and gives him her heart and her estate, and therefore removes some of the things he had to be angry at; and we do not find, that he is perfected in the Christian graces till restored to his birthright, a rental of twenty thousand pounds a year, and married to his lady love. One can afford to be humble and forgiving, when one has a pretty wife and twenty thousand a year. Sydney, the younger brother, is a weakling, very properly married to his cousin Camilla, his exact counterpart; and the world, we presume, goes smoothly with them, for neither has force of character enough to ripple its surface in the slightest degree. Fanny, the heroine, is a feeble copy of Alice, a feeble original, not worth copying. The uncle is a respectable scoundrel, respectably provided for, who takes good care to die when he should. Lord Lilburn is Lumly Ferrers with variations, an accomplished villain, who would have found earth and his *parc-aux-cerfs* a perfect paradise had it not been for the gout, which would now and then interrupt the stream of his bliss. His, by-the-by, is the best drawn character in the book.

Of Bulwer's women, not much can be said in commendation. His beau ideal of a perfect woman is a gentle idiot with a pretty face. A woman with mind, spirit, force and energy of character, he looks upon as a she-demon, sent to torment man before his time. Every man to his taste; yet there are those, who would rather be yoked to a she-devil in good earnest, than to one of these meek, gentle, passive, although loving *innocents*. Love is, no doubt, a very good thing, and not undesirable, but rather insipid after all, without a small dash of spirit to make it effervesce. Love, too, is, no doubt, thaumaturgic, as our Radical says, but we can hardly credit the miracles it is made to work in the cases of Alice and Fanny. It can quicken the intellect, where nature has not denied it, increase its activity, and facilitate its workings, but after all we doubt its power to create it in the naturally-born idiot. Nay, we doubt still more the idiot's capacity of loving. These sweet innocents are as incapable of loving as they are of being loved. So much for Bulwer's women, whose affections

he may share without a rival, excepting, perhaps, Nydia and Ione in the "Last Days of Pompeii," and Madame St. Ventadour in "Ernest Maltravers." Nobody is likely to fall in love with them, or to pine for their embrace.

But, passing over the creations of Bulwer's fancy, — his characters, — we are not quite content with this practice, in which he and others so liberally indulge, of leading us ever through scenes of loathsome depravity, disgusting vice, and black and startling crime. The joke, we in all conscience think, has been carried far enough. Even we can endure it no longer. *Jam satis*, we exclaim; now enough of rogues, villains, swindlers, thieves, pickpockets, gamblers, murderers, dandies, courtezans, prostitutes, *et id omne genus*. In God's name, or if need be, in the devil's name, let them disappear, and honester folk step forth, and act a part. If interest cannot be awakened by pictures of undiseased nature, of truth, beauty, virtue, purity, goodness, then send interest — about its business.

Moreover, we are beginning to grow tired of this dyspeptic literature, which is ever detailing sentimental wretchedness, and leading one to be ever dissecting his own morbid feelings, and to be ever parading them before the world. We have had enough of all this, for one century at least, in Werter and Childe Harold. There is already dyspepsia enough in the world; more, much more than your Grahams, or even your Alcotts can cure. There is no need of increasing the quantity, by bringing to your aid a morbid imagination. Our young men and maidens need other prescriptions. It is time to give them a literature that is strong and healthy, that shall stimulate to action the sound parts of their moral systems; time, in one word, to bid them cease from brooding over their imaginary sufferings, from indulging their petty whinings, and to go forth into the world of love, truth, and beauty, which everywhere smiles around them, and learn to live, to enjoy, and to bless God for the life he has given.

Essays. By R. W. Emerson. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 16mo. pp. 303. — Here is a book everybody will buy and read, and which, whoso reads once, will read again, and again. Mr. Emerson's numerous friends will welcome its publication with delight, and his admirers, which are not a few, will find new fuel for their admiration. Its perusal has even warmed us, cold, stoical, and untranscendental as we are, into something like not admiration, but reverence for the mind, of which it is a sincere utterance. It is a profound and significant word, and will take hold of the heart of the age, perhaps, of the ages. We have no space to speak of it now as we would. We can only say, that he who reads it will find, that he is no longer what he was. A new and a higher life has been quickened in him, and he can never again feel, that he is merely a child of time and space, but that he is transcendental and immortal. The author's stand-point is in the Eternal, and he seeks to discover and set before us, in the mutable, variable, and evanescent, only the elements that do inhabit eternity, and are "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." This book is too significant to be dismissed with this hasty notice. We shall recur to it at our earliest opportunity, and speak of it, if we can, as it deserves.

General History of the World, from the Earliest Times, until the year 1831. By Charles Von Rotteck, LL. D., Professor in the University of Freiburg, Aulic Counsellor, Member of the Chamber of Deputies of the Grand Duchy of Baden, &c. Translated from the German, and continued to 1840. By Frederic Jones, A. M. Illustrated by twenty-four Historical Engravings, designed by Heideldorf, Dalbon. and others; engraved by J. Spittall. First American Edition. Philadelphia: C. F. Stollmeyer. 1840. 4 vols. 8vo. — We beg our readers not to form their opinion of this work from its lumbering title, or its clumsily executed plates. The work is one of real and solid merit, and, perhaps, the best general history of the world, in a reasonable compass, within the reach of the general reader. It is, we are told, very popular in Europe, and it will be, as it deserves to be, here. The translator and the publisher have conferred no mean public benefit by placing it within the reach of the American reader. As a Philadelphia publication, even the style, to speak technically, in which it is "got up," deserves praise. We shall recur to this work again, and endeavor to speak somewhat critically of its merits. In the mean time, we commend it to the public as worthy of their liberal patronage.

A Year's Life. By James Russell Lowell. Boston: Little & Brown. 1841. 16mo. pp. 182. — When we first took up this volume of poems, we confess, we were disposed to throw it aside, as filled with that kind of poetry, which it is said neither gods nor men will tolerate. Recurring to the volume again in a gentler mood, and, perhaps, under the influence of a less *critical* spirit, we found it contained poetry, pure, genuine poetry, and entitled to rank high among the best productions of the American muse. Mr. Lowell has proved himself possessed of true poetic feeling, and of respectable poetic talent. There is an air of repose, of serenity over his poems, that is not common to our writers, whether in prose or verse, and they are characterized by a simplicity and truth of expression, which we shall be glad to see becoming more fashionable.

Mr. Lowell's inspiration appears to be that of Love, but, as was to be expected, the love of the young man, lively, but not deep, fanciful, but not rich nor intense; nevertheless, the inspiration is genuine, and his utterances are not altogether of the imagination. He shows considerable versatility of powers, and if he will give himself more freedom, and follow still more the mood of the moment, he will without any difficulty place himself in the front rank of American poets. He shows a rich mind, good taste, and a chastened fancy. We shall be most happy to greet him again. We can only add, in parting with him, that we were sorry to hear him say,

> "O woman's love! O flower most bright and rare."

We do not question the brightness of woman's love, but we had not supposed it a *rare* flower. Love is the natural element of woman's heart, and it blossoms in every woman's breast, though it be but too often

> "to blush unseen,
> And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

Outlines of Anatomy and Physiology. Translated from the French of H. Milne Edwards. By J. F. W. Lane, M. D. Boston: Little & Brown. 1841. 8vo. pp. 312. — This is a work of great value, and admirably suited to the wants of our higher schools, and the general reader. It possesses the highest scientific authority, emanating as it does from a man, well known and eminently distinguished in his profession. The translator has done his duty faithfully, and the publishers have done theirs, and the public may buy with an assurance of getting their money's worth, which, in these times of making books "to order," is saying not a little.

The Hour and the Man. By Harriet Martineau. 1841. 2 vols. 12mo. — This, in a literary point of view, is the best of Miss Martineau's productions we have seen. It is upon the whole well sustained, and it indicates a higher order of literary talent than we had given Miss Martineau credit for. She has thrown somewhat of the charm of romance over the negro character, and made us feel as much interest in the fate of her personages, as if they were white men and women. In Toussaint L'Ouverture she has drawn a noble character, and that, too, without deviating far from historical truth. Her book will serve to make us study the past history and present condition of Hayti, and, perhaps, to make us think more favorably of the capabilities of the negro race.

Récits des Temps Mérovingiens, précédés de Considérations sur l'Histoire de France. Par Augustin Thierry. 2 tomes. 8vo. 1840. — The name of Thierry is a sufficient guaranty for the interest and value of any work, to which it is attached as author. His narrative always has the charm of a romance, and his philosophical views, which are never unnecessarily obtruded, are profound and just. We always reach the end of one of his historical works with regret, that there is no more of it. His History of the Norman Conquest, which ought to be translated, affords a juster key to English history than any other work we are acquainted with. The work before us, of which two volumes are yet to appear, is designed to sketch the state of society in France under the first race of the Frankish monarchs, in the sixth century, an epoch, in which the barbarians and Gallo-Romans occupy the same soil; but before their manners have become at all assimilated, and before the population has assumed anything of a homogeneous character. This is done by a series of narratives, which, though historically correct, read very much like romances. The work is preceded by considerations on the history of France, of great value.

Boston, March 24, 1841.

TO THE EDITORS OF "THE LOWELL OFFERING."

LADIES, — I have received the first and second numbers of your periodical, for which I beg you to accept my thanks. Your paper is conducted with spirit and ability, and I read it with pleasure. I am particularly interested in it, for I am told that it is written entirely by girls employed in the Mills. It is highly creditable to their talents and taste, and may turn out to be of no slight advantage to them.

I perceive, ladies, that you labor under a slight mistake in regard to me. You seem to have taken it into your heads that I am hostile to you, and have slandered you. If I may be allowed to be my own interpreter, I have had no thought of speaking disrespectfully of you. My sympathies are with the laboring classes, and I have done what I could to ameliorate the condition of both workingmen and workingwomen. I have been an operative myself for no small portion of my life; I have no sympathies with the aristocracy; I have burned with indignation at the injustice done to those, who are obliged to support themselves by their own labor; and this indignation I have expressed as best I could; and for expressing it, I have fallen under the condemnation of your masters and employers. This alone, it would seem, should be sufficient to satisfy you, that I have had no intention of slandering you.

The passage, which has offended you, I think you must have misinterpreted. I have said nothing against you; I have merely spoken of the injustice the world does you; and I have represented that injustice as great enough to "damn to infamy" the most worthy and virtuous girl, if she be a factory girl. Now, it may be possible, that the feeling I have spoken of is not as strong as I have represented it; but, if you will read the article in which my remark appears, you will perceive, I think, that my object was to rebuke your employers and the community generally, not to speak ill of you.

My offence consists solely in saying, that there is in the community

an unjust prejudice against girls employed in factories. Is not this true? That there is a prejudice against you I know, and that it is *unjust*, I have not a doubt. You are, in my judgment, every way equal to the daughters of your employers, and far more useful to the community. Will those daughters treat you as equals? Do they invite you to their parties? and would their brothers be willing to select their wives from your midst, providing always, that you were willing to accept them for your husbands?

There is no need of words on this subject. I know, and so do you, that you cannot assume that rank in society, as factory girls, which you could as daughters of factory owners. Moreover, in most places, you know the factory population forms a population by itself. In most factory villages, in which I have been acquainted, I have found that portion of the population not employed in factories, looking down on the operatives in the Mills. I have rarely known a young man, not employed in a factory, choosing a factory girl for his wife; and I know well the strong prejudice that is felt by operatives in other employments against those in factories. You cannot, as a general rule, return to your early homes, after having spent several years in the Mills, without being made to feel, that the phrase "factory girl" has a meaning not the most pleasant.

You yourselves admit, in the article in which you give me so severe a lecture, that there is a prejudice against you, though you contend it is less than it was. I shall be happy to find it less.

I have asserted the existence of this prejudice, and condemned it. I have never charged it to you as your fault, nor have I ever so regarded it. I charge it to the factory system. I am opposed to that system, and opposed to it, among other reasons, because it subjects you to the prejudice of which I have spoken.

Now, my good friends, what sin have I committed against you and your sisters? I have represented you as suffering from the workings of an iniquitous system; I have condemned that system, and asked that you should be better rewarded for your labors. Is this wrong? I have asked for you a social position equal to that of the wives and

daughters of factory owners; is this wrong? Is this to prove myself hostile to you? I have condemned those who grow rich by your labors, while your wages are not enough to enrich you. And is this hostility to factory girls?

No. I have confidence in your good sense, and your love of justice. You have not understood my language in the sense I used it; but have understood it in the sense given it by those who would prejudice you against me, because they fear that, if I am not rendered odious to the community, I may do something to prevent them from fattening on your labors. My enemies are your enemies; and believe me, they laugh right merrily at your simplicity in condemning me. They would, if they could, prejudice you against every man who has the good sense and the firmness to speak out for the laborer. You may believe them rather than me; but you should remember that I have no interest in prejudicing you against them; while they have a strong interest in prejudicing you against me.

I am contending for a social reform; I would put the "plough into the hand of the owner," and also the spindle and the loom. Your employers do not wish for this change. I wish you, the operatives, to be not only operatives but owners. For this I am laboring. Do you not see then that I am laboring for you against your employers? Do not then be caught in their trap. Do not war for your natural enemies against your friends.

But I am wearying your patience. I have addressed you this letter, because I perceived that you felt yourselves wronged, and that I had wronged you. You were entitled to demand of me an explanation. I believe you wronged, deeply wronged; but not by me; for I have merely stated and condemned the wrong which others do you.

I will merely add, that touching the morals of factory girls I have rarely spoken. I saw some publications in a Boston newspaper sometime since, concerning the girls employed in the mills at Lowell. Those publications were not to your credit; and what is worse, they remain to this day uncontradicted. The feeble attempt of a Lowell paper to contradict merely tended to confirm them. For my own

part, I have no reason for believing the morals of factory operatives are materially different from those of the rest of the community; and certainly because some may be bad, I am not the man to infer that all are. With the population of New England factory villages I have had some acquaintance, and I have known individuals employed as operatives in the Mills, to whose morals I could bear a cheerful and an honorable testimony.

You, ladies, have demanded of me an answer. I have given it; and beg leave to subscribe myself,

Yours very respectfully,

EDITOR OF THE BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

THE

BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1841.

Art. I. — Social Evils, and their Remedy.

We have never pretended, and we do not now pretend, to be able to point out any specific remedy for social evils, or to show how a series of causes may be put in operation, which shall prevent their recurrence.

In the greater part of what we have written in the pages of this Journal, as well as elsewhere, on the subject of social evils, our main purpose has been to bring the subject itself distinctly before the minds of those among us, who give tone to thought and direction to affairs, and to engage them in its serious and earnest consideration. The remedy itself we have expected only as the result of time, and the general activity of the public mind directed to its discovery.

But the subject has finally begun to arrest the attention of the community. Throughout the whole length and breadth of the land, men's minds are busy with it. The problem has come up, and will not down till its solution, at least to a partial extent, is found. We may, then, now desist from our efforts to provoke discussion, and proceed to discuss. The audience is assembled, and a calm, dispassionate, philosophical discussion will now be listened to with eagerness and respect.

Though we confess, in the outset, that we have no

specific remedy for social evils to bring forward, yet we feel competent to indicate the method the inquirer must take in order to find one, and the law by which it is to be applied. And this we proceed now to do, as briefly and as clearly as we can.

The end the Reformer contemplates, and seeks to gain, is the production of harmony, the realization of order in the bosom of the individual, between the various elements and tendencies of his nature, and in the bosom of society, between its several members, and between its members and itself.

The power which we have for accomplishing this end is our activity, or free-agency. This power may or may not be adequate, but it is all that we have, and we can go no further than it can carry us.

But we may make of our activity a two-fold application, and realize the end sought, directly, by efforts to control the appetites and passions; and indirectly, through institutions, by efforts to make them bear on our passivity, and, so far as we are passive beings, aid in moulding us into the sort of beings we should be.

Moral and religious teachers rely chiefly on the first application of free-agency. They proceed on the ground, that direct efforts of free-will in the interior of man are adequate to the realization of order, let external institutions and influences be what they may. They have proceeded on this ground for six thousand years, and with results, which ought ere this to have convinced them that they were guilty of some mistake. In our appetites and passions, from which all disturbing forces proceed, there is at work an activity, which, strictly speaking, is not our activity, and which ours can at best control only to a limited extent. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." Institutions, moral, religious, social, civil, and political, have an almost irresistible influence in determining our characters. Within certain limits they are absolute, and mould us in spite of ourselves. Instead, then, of exhorting men to be what they ought to be, or wasting ourselvesin fruitless efforts to make them what they ought to be, in

spite of these institutions, against the resistance they offer, we should modify, alter, or reconstruct them, so that they shall aid in the production and maintenance of the individual character desired. We cannot carry the river over the mountain, for the law of gravitation is against us; but we can tunnel the mountain, and then the same law of gravitation which before was against us, will operate in our favor, and cause the river to flow in the direction we wish it to flow.

In plain words, the doctrine we would lay down is this: Individual character is the result of the combined action of free-will and necessity, and is to be made what it should be mainly by the efforts of free-will not to overcome necessity, but to avail itself of necessity; as in constructing a mill we avail ourselves of the law of gravitation to drive our machinery. The problem to be solved, then, is, how to modify institutions, whose action on us is that of necessity, so that they shall always aid the growth of individual virtue and happiness.

This problem can never be completely solved. The harmony, the order we are in pursuit of, may be approximated, but we are far from believing that it can ever be fully attained. There is a necessary antagonism in human nature itself, which must forever balk and baffle our wisest and most strenuous efforts to realize perfect peace and harmony in either the bosom of the individual, or in that of society. Man is in his nature a limited, that is, an incomplete, an imperfect being. He has in him elements of growth, of progress, but not of perfection. He can, then, never become, in the strict sense of the word, a perfect being. If he could, he could become God. Society has its root in human nature, and can never surpass the capabilities of that nature. These capabilities reach to progress, but not to perfection; consequently, while we may hope for a continued progress of society towards perfection, we must forever despair of its attaining to perfection.

Man has a two-fold nature. One set of instincts and faculties, which centre in himself, and another set,

whose centre is out of himself. By the first set, he is an individual, is affected by what immediately concerns himself, and induced to look out for himself, to assert and maintain his own personal rights, interests, and dignity. By the second, he is rendered social, capable of binding himself by love and duty to others, and of becoming self-denying, disinterested, and heroic. Between these two sets of instincts and faculties, there is, and there must be, in the very nature of things, antagonism; consequently, the struggle, the combat, the victory, the defeat. This antagonism will reproduce itself in society, and render the struggle there as permanent and as fierce as it is in the bosom of the individual.

Both of these sets of instincts and faculties, or elements of our being, are in their nature indestructible and essential to man. The individual element, the abuse of which is selfishness, is not less essential to man than the social, disinterested, or heroic. It is the element of liberty and of progress. If destroyed, or denied its legitimate scope, the individual is no longer regarded; his well-being is neglected; all individuality expires; society becomes supreme, and exerts the most absolute and galling sway over all her members. On the other hand, if we destroy or neglect the social element, the disinterested, the heroic, we have no social bond, no union, no coöperation, no mutual assistance, no protection for even individuality itself. For all individuality being exclusive, infinitely repellant to every other individuality, each would seek its own gratification at the expense of another; one would prey upon another, the stronger would oppress the weaker, and we should have but one unvarying scene of wrongs and outrages, tyranny and slavery, anarchy, confusion, and war.

Every scheme of reform which overlooks or neglects either of these elements, as well as every scheme which proposes a perfection beyond the capabilities of human nature, must prove abortive, and be merely a monument to the want of practical wisdom in its author.

This fact Reformers are prone to overlook. For ourselves, we have never yet seen a scheme proposed for

either individual or social reform, that did not either neglect one or the other of these elements, or contemplate a perfection, to which neither human nature nor human society can attain.

Mr. Fourier has given us an example of a scheme of this latter sort. His scheme, as ably and faithfully developed in Mr. Brisbane's interesting and valuable volume on the Social Destiny of Man, is ingenious and striking, and at first view attractive, and even plausible. He recognises the antagonism which actually obtains in both the individual and society, and proposes to get rid of it by harmonizing the passions. His scheme may, therefore, be called a scheme of *passional* harmonies, to be produced not by denying, destroying, or subduing the passions, but by affording to each its legitimate gratification. This would, no doubt, succeed, were man only a perfect being, or capable of becoming perfect. Were he so made, that all his passions could be gratified, and so that he would always be satisfied when the passions had attained their special gratification, a scheme of passional harmony might be contemplated with some degree of practical wisdom, as well as with enthusiastic hope; but man, from the very fact, that he is and always must be imperfect, incomplete, is incapable of having all his passions harmonized. He is a musical instrument, that can neither be put nor kept in perfect tune. He was made for progress. Progress consists in overcoming disharmony; and unless it is one day to cease, implies that disharmony can never be entirely overcome.

Moreover, each passion seeks its own special gratification, and can rarely obtain it without thwarting another. It is impossible, for instance, to harmonize benevolence and the love of accumulation; for one finds its gratification in giving away, the other in acquiring and hoarding. Nature, again, is no economist. She secures her ends by an excessive expenditure of means. The end she proposes to secure by any given passion is always good and sacred, but in order to secure it, she lavishes the passion in excess. Take the passion of

love, given to secure the continuance of the species. Wherever this passion exists in sufficient strength and activity to ensure the end for which it was given, it exists in a degree which would push us beyond that end. It demands more than the other elements of our being, without self-denial, can yield it. Restrain it, and it rebels, and makes a disturbance; let it go unrestrained, it becomes morbidly active, destroys the equilibrium of the passions, and both the moral and physical well-being of the individual. And what we say of this passion, we may say of all the passions.

Nor is this all. There is no passion satisfied by possession. Each has a tendency to enlarge its desires in proportion as it obtains. On wishes, wishes grow, and one demand is no sooner complied with, than another and a larger is made. The harmony of all the passions is, therefore, out of the question.

The harmony of the passions, so far as attainable, is to be obtained not by gratifying the desires of each, but by denying to each its special gratification, whenever its special gratification would lead to disorder, either in the bosom of the individual or in that of society; that is, by following the Christian rule, deny thyself, which we shall find but poorly substituted by Mr. Fourier's rule, — please thyself. In fact, the pleasure of self-denial often exceeds that of indulgence. But in all self-denial there is antagonism.

Mr. Owen's community scheme is an example of a different sort. It has some good points. It recognises the influence of institutions, of "circumstances," in forming our characters, and for this it deserves commendation; but it overlooks several essential elements or wants of human nature. In denying the innateness and indestructibleness of the religious element of man, Mr. Owen proves himself a careless psychologist, and a superficial philosopher. This element is essential to man, and is one of the stronger elements of his being. No scheme of society is practicable, that neglects it, and none were desirable, even if practicable. It must have a prominent place in every plan of social reorganization

intended to be acceptable to the race, or permanent and beneficial.

Mr. Owen also neglects activity, free-agency, and, therefore, strictly speaking, man himself. In his scheme, man is the mere creature of circumstances. He has, then, in himself, no active power. He cannot create or modify his Creator. What, then, can he do by way of reform? By denying free-agency, Mr. Owen denies the very instrument with which he must work, and without which it would be absurd to call upon man to be a reformer. Man is active as well as passive, and can act on and mould circumstances as well as they him.

In contending for a community system, Mr. Owen depresses, if he does not wholly destroy, individuality. He seizes on the social or communal element of our nature. This is, unquestionably, the element of union, order, justice, peace; but, when taken exclusively, it makes the community everything, the individual nothing; establishes the absolute authority of the community, which cannot fail to degenerate into practical tyranny, under which both liberty and progress become impossible.

The right of property is denied, too, by his scheme of a community of goods. A community of goods cannot coexist with property; for all property is individual, exclusive. The tenure by which property is held in some countries, and the mode of its transmission and reappropriation in all, may need some important modifications; but the right to property itself is one of our primitive rights, and is, therefore, sacred and divine. Properly speaking, man never feels himself man, till he has something to which he can point and say, "that is mine; touch it not, save as I give thee leave." It is idle to war against this right, for it is indestructible in the human soul; it is wrong to do it, because we should respect all the rights of man, and because its recognition and security have been and ever must be a powerful agent in advancing civilization.

Mr. Owen, also, in our judgment, errs, by denying

the necessity of marriage laws. The actual laws on marriage, in most countries, may, doubtless, need some ameliorations, but the continuance of the marriage relation cannot be left to the discretion of the parties interested, with safety either to society or the parties themselves. Marriage is not a mere private agreement, nor civil contract even, but also a sacrament, and should, therefore, be placed under safeguard of both religion and law. The passion usually most active in leading to marriage is good and holy, as are all the passions; but reason and morality are not sufficient to keep it within bounds. All the passions have a tendency to grow tired of what is familiar, and to crave what is novel. Make the continuance of the marriage relation a mere matter of caprice, as it would be, if all laws on the subject were abrogated, and it would not be seldom that we should find a man divorcing the wife of yesterday to take another that strikes his fancy to-day, who will be equally distasteful to-morrow, and must in her turn give way to another.

Doubtless there are evils, to which married life is now subject, that it were desirable to remedy. Marriage is not always that solace and relief to man's estate it should be. We have ourselves, on a former occasion,* entered our indignant protest against the unhallowed restraint which society exercises over the indulgence of the affections. But the evils complained of are the result of causes which operate before the marriage law takes effect, and are deeply seated in the artificiality of the present social organization, — in its family pride, its factitious distinctions of blood and fortunes, which interrupt the natural course of young affection, and but too often make marriage a mere legalized prostitution, a mere contrivance for uniting families and estates, or for acquiring a fortune. Abolish your factitious distinctions, do away with your gross inequalities of fortune, educate and refine all your children, make honest industry honorable, and so profitable, that a young couple may always

* See Quarterly Review, Vol. III. No. xi. Article *Laboring Classes.*

feel that they will be able to secure a comfortable living by their own labor, and that too *without losing caste*, and the evils now complained of will in a great measure cease to exist.

Mr. Owen, paradoxical as it may seem, relies too much on reason and morality. But these are feeble barriers against passion in its vehemence. We have these now, and law to boot, and yet passion laughs us in the face, not seldom bids us defiance, and goes unwhipt of justice. They may do for those who are naturally frigid, and for those who are "too old to sin," but to rely on them alone for the great mass of mankind, were to open the door to unbridled lust, and its whole desolating train. We should do all in our power so to reorganize society that it shall minister no unnatural stimulus to the passions, but we should also stand ready with law in our hands, to whip them back whenever they undertake to leap their bounds.

This leads us to the conclusion, that they who contemplate reforming society without the aid of government, or introducing a state of society in which government will be superfluous, are also far remote from true practical reformers. This class of reformers are becoming somewhat numerous in our own community. They are a class for whom we have great respect, and among whom we reckon some of our warmest personal friends. They admit the present existence of the antagonism of which we speak, but they think that by a judicious system of moral, intellectual, religious, and physical culture they can overcome it.

But have they reflected on what condition and at what cost they must overcome it, if they overcome it at all? They have a lively sense of individual rights, and they regard government not only as superfluous, but as an unjust restraint upon individual freedom. Now individual freedom and well-being are promoted only by what are called the selfish instincts, or rather those which lead the individual to assert and maintain his own rights and dignity. We have seen already the result to which we must come, if we take our point of

departure in exclusive individuality. Exclusive individuality destroys all individuality, because one individuality cannot tolerate another. You must then control individuality by bringing up the social element. But in order to control it, or rather as our friends propose, subdue it, you must give supremacy to the social element. You must weaken the sense of individuality, and strengthen the sense of society. Now if this be done so far as to get rid of all antagonism, it is done only by the entire suppression of individuality. This would be, if successful, so to enfeeble, to emasculate man, that he would be utterly incapable of fulfilling the functions of his being. He would no longer seek to provide for himself, to prolong his own existence, or even to contribute to the continuance of the species.

To this extent the suppression of individuality is impossible. The element will survive all efforts to destroy it, and exert itself legitimately or illegitimately. The practical effect, therefore, of the effort to destroy it and dispense with civil government, would be to reëstablish a theocracy, the worst and weightiest of all tyranny. The success of our no-government friends, on either hand, would be their defeat. Seeking freedom, they would find slavery; scope for individual activity, they would find themselves without power to act; progress, they would obtain immobility; relief from the burdens of civil government, they would be pressed to the earth by the overwhelming weight of the hierarchy.

These reformers proceed on the ground, that what they term the lower nature of man is too active. They regard, whether aware of it or not, the selfish instincts as immoral; and they place morality in the exclusive exercise of the social, the disinterested, the heroic. These are the higher nature, those the lower. The lower should submit to the higher; and government is now necessary only because the lower are *unduly* active. Government, has, therefore, its necessity in human wickedness, and of course must become unnecessary just in proportion as men become upright and moral. This is

the view taken of human nature by all theocrats, and is the view on which are founded the claims of supremacy set up by the church. This view, taken exclusively, depresses the body, the state, all material interests, and exalts the soul, the church, and spiritual interests generally. It generates mysticism, asceticism, contempt of the world; builds monasteries, nunneries, and establishes the unlimited authority of the priests. The evils of its dominance may be seen through all past history, and in all countries still subjected to a theocratic government.

For ourselves, we protest against this exclusive spiritualism. The soul is no more holy than the body; and morality attaches necessarily no more to the exercise of what is called the higher nature, than to what is called the lower nature. We may be as moral in the exercise of the functions of the body as in the exercise of the functions of the soul, in yielding to the selfish instincts as in yielding to the disinterested. Morality is predicable only of the *motive* with which we act; it matters not whether the *mobile* to act be furnished by one set of instincts or another. The selfish instincts, as they are called, are neither effects nor evidences of the Fall, but are as primitive in man and are as necessary to make up the glory and excellence of his character, as the disinterested and heroic. They should not be cursed, nor should there be any effort to get rid of them. According to Christianity the antithesis between body and soul, insisted upon by the old religions, is done away, and now we should write "Holiness to the Lord," on everything. Man's whole nature rightly exercised, is alike holy.

The selfish instincts, within their legitimate sphere, are as worthy to be obeyed as the disinterested and benevolent; and it is necessary for the well-being of both the individual and the race, that they be always the strongest and most active. The good of the whole is best provided for by making each individual the special guardian of his own.

But if these instincts be the strongest and the most

active, the others will be too weak to control them, and to prevent one individuality from occasionally encroaching on the equal individuality of another. This encroaching neither the individual nor the race can tolerate. Both morality and utility demand its suppression. Hence the necessity of society for perfecting the individual, — society, which may be defined the union of all for the protection of each.

Man has primitive and indestructible wants which crave society and lead to it; he has also instincts essential, as we have shown, to his very existence, and to that of the race, which must be stronger and more active than those, that demand the supervision and control of society. These too are permanent and indestructible, and consequently create a permanent demand for social supervision and control.

But social supervision and control is government; consequently government has an eternal necessity in the permanent and essential nature of man. Society is needed to maintain, in all its entireness, the equal individuality of each and every of her members; and government is the force needed to enable her to do this, and to enable the aggrieved party to compel her to do it, in case she neglects or refuses to do it.

Now as the great work for the social reformer is to provide for the maintenance to each and every individual to his entire individuality, and as this can be done only by society, and by society through government, it follows that government, so far from being an obstacle to reform, a superfluous machine which we should throw aside, is in fact the great and indispensable agent of reform. They, then, who are warring against government, are warring against themselves, throwing away the arms without which their defeat is certain. Instead of advocating their no-government schemes, they should plunge into the science of politics, acquaint themselves with practical statesmanship, and turn the purity of their hearts, the intelligence of their minds, and the enthusiasm of their souls to the work of making government what it ought to be.

We have arrived now at two important conclusions. 1. Man is to be perfected in society; and 2. Society is to be perfected, that is, enabled or compelled to discharge its office in perfecting the individual, by the agency of government.

It follows also from what we have said, that the office of society, so far as concerns our present inquiry, is to maintain for each individual member his entire individuality. This implies the maintenance not only of one individuality against another, but also of the individual against society itself.

The maintenance of each member of society in his entire individuality, is what is commonly meant by maintaining equal rights. But the phrase equal rights does not necessarily cover the whole ground. Rights may be equal without being entire. Society may maintain equal rights, that is, the same number of rights to each of her members, and yet to no one all his rights. She may maintain all the rights of one individual in relation to another, and yet deny to all their rights in relation to herself. We prefer, therefore, the statement we have adopted, which means, for us, all the rights with which the individual is endowed by his Creator, whether they relate to other individuals or to society.

In contending, that it is the office of society to maintain each and every individual in his entire individuality, we of course reject the old doctrine, that the rights of society are made up of the rights surrendered by individuals. Men on coming into civil society do not surrender a portion of their rights for the sake of enjoying the remainder; man comes in, if the expression *comes in* be allowed, for the purpose of having all and every of his rights protected, even to the minutest and apparently the most insignificant. Every member of society, that is, every citizen, — and every one who is properly a man should be a citizen, — has the right to demand the protection here implied, and society fails in her duty, whenever she fails from any cause whatever to afford it.

The rights of the individual may be invaded in two ways. 1. By the encroachment of one individual upon

another. 2. By the encroachment of society herself. The practical political problem then is, how to organize civil society, or how to constitute the government, so as to afford an effective guaranty to all against this double invasion. Government, to meet the exigencies of the case, must be an instrument in the hands of society for protecting one individual against another, and in the hands of individuals for protecting themselves against the encroachments of society. It must then be a contrivance for governing society as well as individuals.

A contrivance of this sort it is not easy to find. It presents the only really difficult problem in political science. Some have thought they found it in monarchy, some in aristocracy, some in democracy, and others in various combinations of these, or in what they have termed mixed governments. In this country the popular solution of the problem is the democratic. We fancy that we find in democracy the form of government needed, and that if we so arrange matters, that the will of the people can always make itself felt and obeyed, all rights are sure to be protected, and the interests and well-being of all secured.

But democracy, as popularly taught, affords the citizen no protection against society. By democracy, as a form of government, is understood generally that form of government in which the people, taken as the state or body politic, are supreme, and may, if not morally, at least in point of fact, do whatever they please. The state is then absolute, and you have an unlimited government, just as much as you would have, were your government an unlimited monarchy. Minorities and individuals have nothing but the wisdom and justice of the majority on which to rely. They are at the mercy of the sovereign, and have no resource if he choose to play the tyrant. Here is no true liberty, no effective safeguard for individual freedom, no power in the hands of the party whose rights may be invaded, except the good pleasure of the invader, with which to obtain redress.

We speak here of democracy in its absolute sense,

and solely as a form of government. Democracy, when understood to mean the end that government should seek, to wit, the maintenance of each individual in the free and full possession of all his natural rights as a man, is unquestionably the creed of every true American, and as one of our distinguished scholars has well said, "practical Christianity;" for in this sense it realizes in our social and political relations the end enjoined by the fundamental principles of the Christian religion. But the growing tendency of our countrymen is to understand by democracy a form of government in which the majority, the absolute numerical majority, may rule unrestrained. The government of this country is regarded as resting solely on the will of the majority. In the words of the late President of the United States, "a breath of the majority has made and can unmake" it. Hence we hear of the "democracy of numbers," and are told on high authority that the "democracy of numbers" is the only intelligible democracy. Then the majority is always the democracy; the party in the majority is always the true democratic party, and the principles and measures of the majority are always democratic principles and measures. Majorities are perpetually shifting. The minority of yesterday is the majority of to-day, and of course what was anti-democratic yesterday is democratic to-day, and will be anti-democratic again to-morrow.

There is among us a strong tendency to sweep away every institution, every organic form, whether in the executive, judicial, or legislative branches of the government, which may have heretofore interposed an obstacle to the free and full expression of the irresponsible will of the majority. Every amendment proposed or adopted of any of our civil constitutions has a direct tendency to throw additional power into the hands of the party, which chances to be in the majority, and to remove some safeguard from the minority. The whole spirit of the American people, not of one party only, is to sweep away all barriers to the establishment of absolute democracy, which shall cause the govern-

ment in its administration to feel and respond to every wave of public opinion, or popular caprice. This is easily accounted for, and is by no means an unnatural tendency; but it is perhaps time to inquire whither it is likely to lead, and whether it is likely to increase the security we demand for individual rights?

We are aware that there is growing up among us a feeling, that majorities can do no wrong, but we have not yet satisfied ourselves that this feeling has any warrant in theory or experience. Majorities, for aught we can see, are as liable to err as minorities. The truly wise and just man not seldom finds himself obliged to desert the majority, nay to stand alone with his single breast against an opposing world. Not seldom is he jeered and scoffed by the multitude, his name a by-word and a reproach.

Our democrats, however, contend that the interests of the majority are in point of fact identical with the interests of the minority, and therefore if the majority can actually be free to promote their own, they will of necessity promote the interests of the whole. All that is necessary, then, is universal education, which shall enable all to see and comprehend their rights and interests, and the measures necessary to secure them; and universal suffrage, by which every man shall have a voice in determining the action of the government. This is plausible, but nevertheless unsatisfactory to those who look at things as they are.

Admit for the present, that the will of the majority, freely expressed, and rendered effective, will secure to every individual the free and full enjoyment of all his natural rights, still universal suffrage coupled even with universal education of the most approved pattern, will by no means secure the free and effective expression of the actual will of the majority. The actual majority of our countrymen are the laboring men. But universal suffrage secures not the expression of their views, convictions, and wishes. They almost uniformly vote against themselves, not through ignorance, but what is to them a moral necessity. They must have employ-

ment, or they and theirs must beg, steal, or starve. This employment they feel that they can obtain only by voting with the small minority on whom they are dependent for it. They dare not vote independently, lest they lose their employment; and consequently they are in elections little else but the servile tools of their employers. This fact is notorious, and it is no uncommon thing for a working man to shift his politics with his employer. Political leaders usually count, as so many votes for their party, the number of voters in the employ of their friends. The friends of the workingmen see and lament this, and seek, vainly, to get rid of the evil by means of the secret ballot.

But waiving this, there is another obstacle, if possible still greater. We suppose that all democratic communities will divide themselves into parties, especially if under the régime of pure, unmixed, unlimited democracy, and usually into two parties of nearly equal strength. There are permanent causes for this division in the antagonism of which we have already spoken. Whatever measure is carried, must then be carried by means of a party. If your party be not in the ascendency, you cannot carry your measure. Your first study must then be to secure the ascendency of your party. This can be done only by means of union and concert among all its members; and union and concert can be obtained only by establishing and respecting what are termed party usages. These usages will require you to support the measures and candidates of your party.

But these measures and candidates are rarely determined on by the spontaneous voice of the whole party. They are determined on by the few more active partizans, usually designated party leaders. These cut and dry the policy of the party. The party may not approve this policy, but it must adopt it, or endanger its success, and give ascendency to the opposing party; which will generally be regarded as the greater evil of the two. A majority of the more active members of the party, therefore, adopt what their leaders propose, pass resolutions in its favor, and rally the

whole party to its support. The party, we will suppose, succeeds, elects its men and carries its measures. Are these measures really carried by the majority of the whole people? Are they in truth expressions of the actual will of the majority? Not at all. They are in truth only the expressions of the will or the policy of the active minority of the party, which is itself but a lean majority of the whole people. If the actual opinion of those who in both parties are really opposed to them could be collected, you would not unfrequently have an overwhelming majority against them. In point of fact, what we call the decision of the majority in this country, is rarely anything more than the decision of the active or adroit minority which controls the party, that for the time being chances to be in the ascendant. Universal suffrage then, coupled with universal education, cannot secure even the expression of the will of the majority, to say nothing of giving us assurance that the will of the majority shall always be just and right.

Nor is this all. Government, as soon as it goes into operation, divides the community into two classes, and creates an inequality, and an opposition of interests between the few and the many. It collects its taxes from the whole people indeed, but it pays them out to the few. These few consequently receive more from the government than they pay to it; and the many consequently pay more than they receive from it. The interest of the many is to pay as little as possible, and of the few to make them pay as much as possible. The few are, by their position and their relation to the government, constituted a plunder party, and they are induced by all the force of selfishness, which always increases by what it feeds upon, to make the government an instrument for plundering the people to the greatest possible extent. These few have the command of the government, for they are the small minority governing the ruling party. Now against these plunderers, these wielders of the whole organized power of the community, what are single individuals, however independent in their suffrages, or however moral and

enlightened in their aims? They are as the reed before the blast. They may be trampled on with impunity.

It may be said that they may denounce the party in power, raise the cry of "retrenchment and reform," and bring up and bring in a new party. Be it so. The chiefs of the new party as soon as in power will constitute a new plunder party, more greedy than the last, because they have for some time been keeping Lent. They will find "retrenchment and reform" difficult. The business of the country is increasing, new settlements are springing up, population is enlarging, interests and relations are multiplying, and demanding a larger number of public officers and additional expenditures. Every new party coming into power among us comes in on the cry of "retrenchment and reform;" but alas! each new one proves itself more burdensome than the last.

The security we demand for individuality, therefore, is not to be found in universal suffrage and universal education, good and indispensable as both unquestionably are. No unlimited form of government will answer our purpose; because every unlimited form of government establishes the absolute rule of society, and therefore deprives the individual of all guaranty for his individuality, — placing him entirely at the mercy of an arbitrary will, and as much so when that will is the will of the many, as when it is the will of the one or the few.

The individual, however enlightened and moral, we have seen is too weak to withstand the cupidity of the plunder party, which the party of the government always is, and always will be. He alone cannot protect his rights, or compel society to do it. In order to protect him you must league him with a part or a portion of the community, which shall make common cause with him, and have the power to arrest the action of government the moment it invades or threatens to invade his rights.

The framers of our institutions have not altogether

overlooked this. They have sought to protect minorities and individuals, by the separation of the functions of government into three departments, each in the main independent of the other; by dividing the legislative branch into two houses; and by the adoption of written constitutions defining the powers of each department, and of the whole government. They have had a horror of all absolute governments, and have sought to limit the government they established. They were wiser than we commonly represent them, and many of the checks and balances they introduced, which we are warring against, are of no small use in protecting minorities and individuals in their rights. They sought, in one word, to establish a CONSTITUTIONAL government, a government of limited powers, containing in itself a power of arresting its own action whenever disposed to transcend its legitimate bounds.

This idea is fundamental and just. Constitutional government is the only government under which there can be any real liberty, any effective safeguard for the rights, the individuality of the citizen; and it will be a sad day for us, when in obedience to monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical tendencies, we are led to abandon constitutional forms of government for an absolute government.

Our countrymen are in general strongly attached to constitutional forms of government, and have no intention of weakening or abandoning them, but they do not, as it appears to us, always fully comprehend the precise nature of constitutional government. It is generally admitted that the constitution prescribes the mode and the limits within which the several departments of the government shall act; but it is not always perceived that the constitution is in fact only so much waste paper, if it proceed from the same power which performs the ordinary functions of government and legislation. The ordinary power of government and legislation, in a government like ours, is the will or assent of the majority. Now if this same majority make the constitution, or may unmake it at will, the

constitution can at best impose only a temporary check on its will. It is as absolute as if there were no constitution at all. Does the constitution emanate from the simple numerical majority of the people? Then it is nothing but a self-imposed restraint, a charter granted by the sovereign, but revocable at will. Have the majority an absolute right, or the absolute power, of interpreting the constitution, of determining the meaning of its provisions? Then the constitution is nothing but what the majority choose to make it, and consequently we are just as much under the absolute majority, as we should be in case we had no constitution. Nor will it alter the case if a special umpire for deciding on the constitutionality of questions be instituted, if that umpire be appointed by the majority, or be so constituted as naturally to express the sense of the majority.

It is essential to constitutional government, that the constitution be made by a different power from the one which acts in ordinary legislation, and that it rest for its support on a power which can effectively maintain it, in case the government proper manifests a disposition to transcend its limits. The people assembled in convention differs in no respect from the people assembled in the halls of legislation, as to the actual power which is at work. If the delegates chosen to the convention represent the numerical majority of the people, what do they represent but the very majority represented by the members of the legislature, in case that legislature be based solely on population? We want in fact in the state two powers, which shall serve to restrain each the other. One of these powers should make the constitution, the other should operate within the limits of that constitution in the performance of the ordinary functions of government. The constitution is then a real check on ordinary government and legislation, the real sovereign of the country, of which government in its restricted sense is merely the agent or minister.

This constitution-making power we have not in all cases provided for. In our own Commonwealth, the

same power, with a slight restriction, that makes the laws, can alter the constitution. The constitution with us is only what the will of the majority makes it, or suffers it to be. It is in fact then no restriction on the power of the majority. It is only the restriction the majority imposes on itself during its pleasure.

But how are we to obtain a constitution-making power different from the power of the majority? We must do it, if we may borrow the words of a distinguished American statesman,* "by means of some contrivance for collecting the sense of the community through its parts." By the concurrence of the several parts we form the constitution, which must be the enumeration and limit of the powers to be exercised by the simple numerical majority.

A contrivance of this sort would give us a double majority; the simple, absolute, numerical majority of the whole community, and the concurring majorities of the several parts. The concurring majorities of the parts would be the sense of a much larger portion of the community than is represented by the numerical majority, and would also embody the sense of parts, which might have interests and wishes different from those of the numerical majority. So long as this sense could be effectively expressed, no part could be injured, and the numerical majority would be obliged to confine its action to those matters and interests which were common to the whole. The concurring majorities, or the sense of the community as collected through its parts, should make the constitution. The numerical majority should operate only within the limits of the constitution.

Take, as an illustration of this, the constitution of the United States. This constitution was not formed by nor does it rest on the will of the majority of the people of the United States, as contended by the late President in his Inaugural Address; but was formed and can be altered only by the concurring major-

* John C. Calhoun.

ities of the several States. It embodies the sense of the American community as collected through its parts, without reference to absolute numbers. The sense of Rhode Island, as an independent part, counts as much in forming or amending the constitution as the sense of New York. The majority of the whole people can therefore legitimately exert no more power than will be concurred in by the several parts, or to speak strictly no power that one fourth of the parts withhold. The constitution is therefore an example of what we term concurring majorities, or majorities of the several parts. The law-making power of Congress, on the other hand, is an example of the absolute or numerical majority, and being limited by the constitution, is restricted, restrained in its exercise by the concurring majorities.

A contrivance analogous or equivalent to this, is needed in the several States. But here it is less easy to introduce it, because interests and localities are more homogeneous, and it is more difficult to organize the community into distinct parts. To introduce some distinction of the kind, some contrivance for taking, in addition to the sense of the absolute majority, the sense of the natural divisions of the community, is and should be the aim of every true statesman. Universal suffrage collects, after a sort, it is true, the sense of the parts; but these parts are simple individuals, and the simple individual is too weak, as we have shown, to constitute a sufficient barrier to the invasion of the numerical majority, or rather the plundering minority that controls it. How it shall be introduced we do not now undertake to point out. The contrivance must vary with localities and the peculiar habits, tastes, customs, and pursuits of the community. The same contrivance will not answer for every community. Nor can it anywhere be arbitrarily introduced. It must ever be merely a modification or development of what already exists. In Rome it was obtained by the establishment of the Tribunitial power. In England it is obtained by means of Three Estates, each having a negative on the

others; in France they have attempted it by the same means, but have unfortunately given the balance of power to the king. In this State we formerly sought it, by basing one House on valuation, and by representing townships rather than population in the other. Vermont, which is the most truly democratic in her legislation, composes her legislature entirely of delegates from townships or corporations. Each township is a distinct part, and is represented in the government, without any reference to the number of its inhabitants. The small township has the same representation with the large. This is a wise regulation, and Vermont is much indebted to it for the liberal character of her legislation, and the free and independent spirit of her inhabitants. She is never subjected to the sway of the absolute majority, but even in her ordinary legislation collects the sense of her community through its parts. The particular manner of organizing the State, so as always to have the concurrence of the parts as a check upon the absolute numerical majority, must be left to the particular State, to be determined according to its already existing natural or artificial divisions. In some States it may be done by regarding territorial divisions, in others, perhaps, by making valuation instead of population the basis; in some by taking the concurring majorities only in forming the constitution, and in others by representing these in one House and the numerical majority in the other. The precise manner of getting at it is the question for the practical statesmen of the community it concerns. All we can add is, that without some contrivance of the sort, a wise administration of government, and its beneficial working will be a matter of accident, never to be counted on with any degree of certainty.

In passing, we may remark, as it concerns our own Commonwealth, the tendency has been in an opposite direction. Our Senate was formerly based on valuation; we have now based it on population; our House of Representatives was formerly based on corporations, (townships); but we are every year approaching near-

er and nearer to population, and have already come so near, that Boston and three or four other large towns control the whole legislature. This tendency has been looked upon as democratic. Perhaps it were well to inquire, if it has rendered legislation more favorable to the rights of individuals, and afforded additional protection to minorities. Many things are thought to be democratic, against which a wise statesman will set his face. It is not democracy we want, but good government, a government which secures to each individual, by effective guaranties, the free and full enjoyment of all his natural rights. These guaranties, which are the substance, may be lost, while we are in pursuit of abstractions, and theoretic unity, which are often but mere shadows. All good government is founded in compromise, and is more or less complicated. To simplify it is nothing else but to render it absolute. If we simplify so as to render all consistent with the popular idea of democracy, we only bring individuals and minorities under the absolute sway of the majority. If we simplify in favor of aristocracy, it is to subject the many to the absolute supremacy of the few. If in favor of monarchy, it is to reduce all under the dominion of one. We must take care not to simplify till we simplify away all our rights, all that government is instituted to protect.

The right organization of the government, that is, such an organization of the commonwealth, of civil society, that the parts may always have a sort of suspensive veto on the whole, when its action becomes oppressive to any part, or goes beyond its constitutional limits, we hold to be the first object to be aimed at by the reformer as well as by the statesman. The first thing is to get a good government. This is the greatest of all earthly blessings to any people. Till this be obtained, there is no security for individual freedom, and consequently none for individual or social progress. The germs, or rather the outlines of a good government, each State in our confederacy has already adopted. Some modifications in accordance with various localities, ways

of thinking, and pursuits, will give good governments, so far as concerns their organic forms, to all. This done, it will not be difficult to secure their wise and faithful administration, to make them in fact as well as in name, agents for protecting each individual in the free and full enjoyment of his entire individuality.

We have in this paper endeavored to give a practical direction to our remarks. We have heretofore speculated not a little, and presented the subject of social reform on its ideal side, which was not amiss. For the ideal has its place, and an important one too, more important than our countrymen usually give it. But the practical has also its place; and when we come to the matter of acting, the question is never, what is in the number of future possibilities, but what is possible now, men and things being as they are, and what they are? We must come down from the ideal to answer this question, and forego our ecstasies. We must take sober views, and be after all somewhat moderate in our demands.

We have also given the direction we have to our remarks, with the hope of drawing attention more directly to the importance and precise nature of constitutional government. Our countrymen are all attached to constitutional government, and so far very well; but they seem to us to be far from comprehending the real nature of constitutional government in general, and their own in particular. We would, if we could, provoke the discussion of constitutional questions. The popular text-books and interpretations of our existing constitutions are unworthy a people engrossed in political matters as we are. In this part of the country constitutional law is hardly recognised. We have been engaged in the discussion of merely local or temporary questions, or in attempting to define abstract democracy. We complain not of this; but we think it is time to sink our political attorneyism, and even our political metaphysics, in wise, liberal, and philosophical statesmanship.

In conclusion, we would say, that in appealing so directly as we do to government, and making it almost the sole agent through which we are to remedy social evils, we by no means forget religion, morality, or individual intelligence. No man can rate them higher than we do. We hold them absolutely indispensable. But they must not be imprisoned in the bosom of the individual. They must be brought out of the interior of man, and made to disclose the true end of all social institutions, and to contribute to their adoption. We would always write as the Christian and the moralist, as well as the statesman. But we would use Christianity and morality in organizing the state and shaping its measures, not less than in our private exhortations to individuals. The end disclosed by true religion, the one enjoined by morality, and that sought by the state, are one and the same; to wit, the freedom and progress in virtue and happiness of every individual. Unless the state maintain freedom for the individual, religion and morality can do little besides solace him in his sufferings, and strengthen him for his trials. This is no doubt a high office, and never to be thought lightly of; but the intelligence, purity, and loftiness of soul, religion and morality are fitted to quicken, should be directed to the establishment of such institutions, and the enactments of such laws, as shall always favor truth, justice, freedom, order, and well-being.

EDITOR.

ART. II. — *Essays.* By R. W. EMERSON. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1841. 16mo. pp. 303.

IN this Journal for April last, we called attention to these Essays, and promised that we would take an early opportunity to speak of them more at large. The promise we then made, we proceed now to redeem. And yet we hardly know how to do it. The Essays

are good and significant, but exceedingly troublesome to reviewers, for whose especial ease and convenience they seem by no means to have been written. They contain no doctrine or system of doctrines, logically drawn out, and presented to the understanding of the reader. They consist of detached observations, independent propositions, distinct, enigmatical, oracular sayings, each of which is to be taken by itself, and judged of by its own merits. Consequently, it is impossible to reduce their teachings to a few general propositions, and to sum up their worth in a single sentence.

To most persons, who read these Essays, they will seem to be wanting in unity and coherence. They will always strike as beautiful, often as just, and sometimes as profound; but the reader will be puzzled to round their teachings into a whole, or to discover their practical bearing on life or thought. Yet they have unity and coherence, but of the transcendental sort. The author seems to us to have taken, as far as possible, his stand in the Eternal, above time and space, and tried to present things as they appear from that point of vision, — not in their relation to each other as seen in the world of the senses, but in their relation to the spectator, who views them from above the world of the senses.

This fact should be borne in mind. Mr. Emerson, to speak scientifically, is no philosopher. He is a philosopher neither in the order of his mind, nor in his method of investigation. He explains nothing, accounts for nothing, solves no intellectual problem, and affords no practical instruction. He proposes nothing of all this, and, therefore, is not to be censured for not doing it. He is to be regarded as a Seer, who rises into the regions of the Transcendental, and reports what he sees, and in the order in which he sees it. His worth can be determined, that is, the accuracy of his reports can be properly judged of, by none except those who rise to the same regions, and behold the universe from the same point of view.

Writers like Mr. Emerson are seldom to be consulted for clear, logical, systematic expositions of any subject

or doctrine, never for the purpose of taking them as teachers or guides in the formation of opinions; but for the suggestions, the incentives to thought they furnish, and the life they kindle up within us. They are thought by some to be writers without any practical value for mankind; but they have, in fact, a very high practical value; only not of the every day sort, only not that of dogmatic teachers or scientific expositors. They present new aspects of things, or at least old familiar objects in new dresses, the various subjects of thought and inquiry in new relations, break up old associations, and excite to greater and fresher mental activity. After having read them, we cannot say that we are wiser or more learned than we were before; we cannot say that we have become acquainted with any new facts in the history of man or of the universe, or that we have any new ideas in regard to the human soul or its Creator; but we feel, that somehow or other new virtue has been imparted to us, that a change has come over us, and that we are no longer what we were, but greater and better.

These are not the only writers we need; but they have their place, and one of high trust, and of no slight influence. Their influence is not sudden, noisy, obvious to all senses, but slow, silent, subtle, permanent, entering into and becoming an integrant part of the life of the age, sometimes of the ages. They live and exert a power over the souls of men, long after their names are forgotten, and their works have ceased to be read. They are never in vogue with the multitude, but they are admired in select circles, who inhale their spirit, and breathe it into other and larger circles, who in their turn breathe it into the souls of all men. Though they may seem to have no practical aim, and no reference to every-day life, they have in the end a most important practical bearing, and exert a controlling influence over even the business concerns of the world. Let no one, then, regard them as mere idle dreamers, as mere literary toys, with whose glitter we may amuse ourselves, but without significance for the world of reality. They appear always for good or evil, and their appearance usually marks an epoch.

Mr. Emerson's book is a sincere production. It could have been produced only in this community at the present moment, and only by a man who had been placed in the relations he has to society and the Church. Such a book could never have emanated from a man, who had not been bred a clergyman, nor from one, who, having been bred a clergyman, had not ceased to be one. We may also say, that it could have been produced by no man, who had not been bred in a creed, which he had found insufficient to meet the wants of his intellect and heart, and who had not, in some measure, deserted it, without having found another in all respects satisfactory. We may say again, he must have been bred a unitarian, and having found unitarianism defective in consequence of its materialism, have felt and yielded to the reaction of spiritualism, and yet not sufficiently to return to any of the standard forms of orthodoxy.

We would speak respectfully of unitarianism, as we would always of the dead. It had its mission, and it has, in the providence of God, done great good in our community. But unitarianism was not, strictly speaking, a religion, could not become a religion; and it is well known, that almost always persons brought up under its influence, desert it as soon as they become seriously impressed, and desirous of leading religious lives. Men never embraced unitarianism because they were pious, but because they would dispense with being pious. Unitarianism never spoke to the heart, to the soul; never waked any real enthusiasm, or called forth any religious energy of character. It is in its nature *un*spiritual, merely intellectual and material, a sort of baptized atheism. The same causes, at bottom, which produced deism and atheism in France, produced unitarianism in New England. If the American mind had been as consequent as the French, as bold to push a doctrine to its last results, and had the Church here been organized as it was in France, and been as oppressive, our unitarians would have been avowed deists or atheists. We can find no more to feed our piety in the

"*Statement of Reasons*," than in the "*Systême de la Nature.*" Indeed, the author of the latter seems the more pious worshipper of the two, and betrays altogether more of peculiar religious emotion; and reverence is more readily yielded to d'Holbach's Nature than to Norton's Divinity. The one is living, plastic, active; the other is a stern, old mechanic, placed on the outside of nature, and troubling himself rarely with its operations; wrapping himself in night and silence, neither seen nor needed by men, and would be unconceived of, did he not charitably send us now and then a messenger to inform us that he really is, and no fiction, — a piece of information altogether gratuitous, as it serves no useful purpose in either the economy of nature or of salvation. With this "Statement of Reasons," unitarianism died, and there are few mourners to go about the streets, albeit there is for it no resurrection.

The old forms of faith had ceased to satisfy the minds of the generation preceding us. Calvinism could not be explained on the principles of Locke's philosophy, and the asceticism which puritanism had enjoined could not but be distasteful and offensive to the growing aristocracy of a prosperous country. Men politely educated, sumptuously clad, fond of good eating and drinking, full of hilarity and mirth, feeling in themselves an exuberance of life, and finding the world very well adapted to their tastes, and being, therefore, in no hurry to exchange it for another, were ill prepared to embrace the ascetic doctrines and practices of their stern old fathers, who never suffered their rigid features to relax with a smile, who thought to please God only by marring the beauty of his works, and by trampling under foot the choicest of his blessings. We do not blame them much. These old puritans are a very unpoetic race of beings, and neither so pious nor so ascetic, so ungiven to the flesh withal, as their admirers would fain have us believe, as may be learned by whomsoever will take the trouble to consult our old church records. They were a strong race, and able to do much; but they attempted altogether more than they could do. They under-

took to demolish both the flesh and the devil, and to live on earth as they expected to live in heaven; that is, in surly communion with their own thoughts, and in singing psalms, with no better accompaniment than a jews-harp. Peace to their ashes. They were not without their mission, and have left their track on the ages. Perhaps, with less sourness, surliness, less rigidity, and with more of the amiable, the gentle, the attractive, they could not have done their work.

But the asceticism, which our puritan fathers insisted on, can be really practised by a people only while in the wilderness; while poor, exposed to a thousand hardships, and finding earth no resting place, but a weary land, from which any deliverance may be accounted a blessing. In proportion as the wilderness is peopled, the barren waste converted into the fruitful garden, as grow the ornamental shrubs, and blossoms the rose, and delights are multiplied around us, we take more cheerful views of the world, and of life, and seek not to mortify ourselves, but to enjoy. Asceticism must, then, give way in practice, if not in theory. It did give way in practice, and for years all New England presented the spectacle of a people professing one faith, and living according to another. Some saw this, and being honest, were shocked at it. These became unitarians. Unitarianism was with us a protest against asceticism, even more than against the absurdity of Calvinism, as contemplated from the point of view of the Lockian philosophy. It was an effort of those who could not live in a perpetual lie, to reconcile their theology and their religion to their philosophy and their mode of living.

For a time it could do very well; and as long as controversy could be maintained with opposing sects, it could apparently sustain some degree of intellectual life; but no longer. As soon as the orthodox ceased to controvert, threw it back on itself, left it to its own resources, it ceased to live.

Inasmuch as it was a dissent from the popular faith, unitarianism appealed to freedom of thought and inquiry. It asserted the rights of the individual reason.

They who became unitarians, then, were not bound to continue such. They had a right to examine unitarianism, as well as the doctrines opposed to it. Such, again, was its own intrinsic deficiency, its utter inadequacy, as a religion, that the moment its own friends began to investigate it, they found they had outgrown it. They found elements in their nature it did not and could not accept, wants it did not and could not meet. They revolted against its materialism, its dryness, coldness, deadness. They fell back on the religious element of their natures, and sought refuge in a more spiritual philosophy. In this state of transition from materialism to spiritualism, from unitarianism to a modified orthodoxy, if we may be allowed the expression, our unitarian community now is. This transition is represented, in certain of its phases, in the book before us. It marks a movement of the unitarian mind towards a higher, a broader, a more truly religious faith and life. In this consists its significance, and if our orthodox friends were aware of this, they would read it with avidity and profit by it.

This revolt against materialism, and this return towards spiritualism, we regard as among the chief glories of our epoch, as a proof that the reign of infidelity is well nigh over, and that we are preparing a religious future. In this point of view, the men among us who represent this movement, and are for the present condemned, in no measured terms, as was to be expected, by both unitarians and the representatives of the old trinitarian asceticism, the old Calvinistic spiritualism, are the real benefactors of their age and country; the men, who, instead of abuse and discouragement, deserve honor and coöperation. But we never recognise our redeemers till we have crucified them. We cannot say of a truth, that they are sons of God, till we perceive the darkness which comes over the earth as they leave it.

These Essays mark among us the reaction of spiritualism. This constitutes their historical value. How far they represent truly the spiritualism that should be-

come dominant, is another question, and one which can be answered only by determining their positive value. This last can be done only by entering into a critical examination of their merits, a thing which it seems to us almost sacrilegious to attempt. They do not seem to us legitimate subjects of criticism. There is a sacredness about them, a mystic divinity, a voice issuing from them, saying to critics, "Procul, O procul, este, profani." To do them justice, they should be read with reverence, with a yielding spirit, an open heart, ready to receive with thankfulness whatever meets its wants or can be appropriated to its use. The rest, what is not congenial, should be left with pious respect; perhaps there are souls which will find it wholesome food. Why should we deprive others of appropriate nutriment, because it is no nutriment to us?

But Mr. Emerson sometimes descends from the Seer, and assumes the Reasoner. He sometimes touches on dogmas and systems, and if he adopts rarely a philosophical form, a system of philosophy lies back of his poetic utterances, and constitutes even for him the ground on which they are to be legitimated. This system we may examine without profanity. It will, moreover, be ultimately drawn out and formally taught by his disciples. His book will give it currency, and be appealed to as its authority. There can, then, be no impropriety in asking if it be true or false, complete or incomplete.

This system, we say distinctly, is not scientifically taught in the book before us. We are not sure that Mr. Emerson himself is always conscious of it. We are inclined to believe, that he thinks that he eschews all systems, and entangles himself in the meshes of no theory. But every man who speaks at all implies a theory, and in general the greatest theorizers are those who profess to abjure all theory. Every man has his own point of view, from which he contemplates the universe, and whence all his reports are drawn. The question may, then, always come up, is this the true point of view, the point from which the universe may be seen

as it really is, and represented in all its unity and diversity? The moment this question is asked, and we undertake to answer it, we plunge into metaphysics, and avail ourselves of system, of theory.

Mr. Emerson's point of view is, we have said, the transcendental. Can the universe, seen from this point of view alone, be truly represented? The answer to this question will enable us to determine the philosophic value of his Essays.

In the philosophy against which there is, in our times, a decided movement, there is no recognition of a transcendental world, of aught that transcends time and space. Immensity is merely space that cannot be measured; eternity is merely time without end. God, as well as man, exists in time and space, and differs from man only in the fact that he fills all space, and continues through all time. Eternal life is a life in time, but merely time endlessly continued. This philosophy never, therefore, carries us out of time and space. To all persons embracing this philosophy, transcendentalists must appear mere dreamers, endeavoring to give to airy nothing, a local habitation and a name.

Now, transcendentalism recognises a world lying back of and above the world of time and space. Time and space belong merely to the world of the senses; but the reason, — not as the principle of logic, but as the principle of intelligence, — rises immediately into a region where there is no time, no space. Immensity is not space infinitely extended, but the negation of all space; eternity is not time endlessly continued, but the negation of all time. God does not exist in space. We cannot say that he is here, there, somewhere, but that he is everywhere, which is only saying again, in other words, that he is NOWHERE. He exists not in, but out of time. We cannot say God was, God will be, but simply that he *is*, as the Hebrew name of God, I AM, plainly implies. To him there is no time. He has no past, no future. He inhabiteth eternity, dwells not in time, but in NO-time, as Watts implies, when he says, with God "all is one eternal NOW."

All our ideas of truth, justice, love, beauty, goodness, are transcendental. Truth is truth, independent of time and place. The just is the just at one epoch, in one country, as much as in another. The beautiful never varies; its laws, we all say, are eternal. Goodness is ever the same. The great principles of the Christian religion inhabit eternity. Hence Jesus says, "before Abraham was I am," and hence he is called "the Lamb slain from the foundations of the world," meaning thereby, that the principles of truth and duty he represented, and by which alone man can come into harmony with his Maker, were no principles of modern creation, but principles existing in the very Principle of things, — principles that have no dependence on time and space, but were in the beginning with God, and were God.

These remarks will help us to understand what is meant by transcendentalism. Transcendentalism, in its good sense, as used in our community, means the recognition of an order of existences, which transcend time and space, and are in no sense dependent on them, or affected by them. Transcendental means very nearly what our old writers, in Shakspeare's time, meant by the word *metaphysical*, from μετα, *beyond*, and φυσικος, *physical*, natural, belonging to the outward, visible, material world. Transcendentalists recognise a world lying beyond or above the world of the senses, and in man the power of seeing or knowing this transcendental world immediately, by direct cognition, or intuition.

All persons, who believe in God, in the reality of a spiritual world, and contend that their belief has any legitimate basis, are transcendentalists. Whoever is not a transcendentalist, must, if consequent, needs be a skeptic, or a materialist and an atheist. The early Christian fathers were transcendentalists, so were the distinguished English writers of the seventeenth century; so were Descartes, Malebranche, George Fox, William Penn, and our own Edwards; so were Price, and to a feeble extent, the Scottish School; so are

nearly all the Germans, and the French Eclectics. Locke and his followers were not, nor were Condillac and the old French school. In fact, all real faith implies the Transcendental, and religion is an idle dream unless we admit the reality of an order of existences, a spiritual world transcending this outward, material, sensible world; and also unless we admit in man the means of attaining legitimately to faith in that reality.

Mr. Emerson, by taking his stand in this transcendental region, evidently asserts its existence, and our power to take cognizance of it. So far his philosophy is eminently religious, and as we have demonstrated over and over again in the pages of this Journal, as well as elsewhere, is sound, and worthy of all acceptation. In this consists his chief philosophical merit. In this too consists his departure from Locke and the unitarian school proper, and his approach to orthodoxy. Thus far we go with him heart and hand, and recognise him as a fellow-laborer in that school of which we profess to be a disciple, though it may be an unworthy one.

But the transcendental, or, if you please, metaphysical, or spiritual world, exists not for the senses, nor can it be inferred from data furnished by the senses. It exists only for the reason. It is ideal, as opposed to sensible, spiritual as opposed to material, but real and substantial. Its existence is indeed involved in all the perceptions of the senses, and asserted in every thought and affirmation; but we rise to the cognition of it only by means of reason, taken, as we have said, not as the principle of logic, but as the principle of intelligence.

Now, by taking our stand on the reason as the principle of intelligence, which is partly analogous to what Mr. Emerson calls the "Over-Soul," and attending exclusively to what it reveals, we are in danger of losing sight of the world of the senses, and therefore of suffering one aspect of the universe to escape us. The moment we rise into the world of reason, we find it altogether richer, sublimer, more beautiful, than this outward visible world. This outward visible world

gradually loses its charms for us, disappears from the horizon of our vision, and is therefore very naturally denied to have any existence. We thus fall into Idealism.

Again; the world of the senses is manifold and diverse, while the world of the reason is one and identical. In the transcendental world we rise to the principles of things. The principle of a thing is after all, in a certain sense, the thing itself. All principles proceed from and centre in one common principle, the principle of all things, — God. The diversity noted by the senses is then no real diversity, but merely phenominal and illusory, and deserving no account from him who has risen to the perception of absolute unity, into which all is resolved at last. Diversity is therefore rejected, denied. The distinction between cause and effect ceases then to be intelligible; all difference between God and the universe to be perceptible. The universe is identical with God. God and the universe are one and the same; this is Pantheism.

Whoever then takes his stand exclusively in the Transcendental must fall into ideal Pantheism. From the transcendental point of view alone, a correct report of the universe cannot be made out, any more than from the point of view of the senses alone.

Now Mr. Emerson seems to us to verify in his own case the truth of this deduction. He falls in his philosophy, so far as philosophy he has, into ideal Pantheism. He is so charmed with the world of ideas, that he contemns the sensible, so struck with the unity and identity revealed by the reason, that he is led to overlook and occasionally to deny the manifold and the diverse, revealed by the senses. We cannot read a page of these Essays without perceiving that the tendency of his mind is to seek unity and identity. He brings together in the same sentence perpetually persons and things, events and transactions, apparently the most diverse, by a law of association which most readers are unable to discover, and the point of resemblance between which very few are able to perceive. Yet is he

in general just. The resemblance, the identity he asserts is there. His power of detecting the identical in the diverse, the analogous in the dissimilar, the uniform in the manifold, the permanent in the transitory, is remarkable, and unsurpassed in any writer of our acquaintance. He is ever surprising us by unexpected resemblances. To him all things are the same. In all this he is right. He uttered a great truth when he declared the identity of the power by which Lazarus was raised from the dead, and that by which falls the rain or blows the clover; also when he so shocked some of our pious people by declaring the identity of gravitation and purity of heart. This identity does run through all nature, and he has no true insight into the universe who cannot detect it.

But diversity, dissimilarity, multiplicity, are no less obvious and real in the universe than unity and identity. They have their origin too in the same source. God, the cause and principle of the universe, is not a mere unity, but a unity that has in itself the principle of multiplicity, — not pure identity, but at once identity and diversity, — a fact shadowed forth in the doctrine of a Triune God, which runs through all religious philosophies ever promulgated. Whoever overlooks this fact must fall into Pantheism. Mr. Emerson has a tendency to overlook it; and his disciples, for disciples always exaggerate the tendencies of their masters, will most assuredly overlook it. Some of them even now avow themselves Pantheists, and most of the young men and maidens who listened with so much delight to these Essays when they were delivered as lectures, virtually run into Pantheism, whether they know it or not.

The outward visible world is not the only world into which we are admitted, but it is a real world; that is, it really exists, and is no more an illusion than the world of reason; and the idealist is as exclusive and as erroneous as the materialist. The one denies the Transcendental, the other the Sensible. Both are wrong in what they deny, both are right in what they assert; and this fact, it strikes us, does not lie at the basis of Mr. Em-

erson's philosophy. Hence the wrong tendency of his speculations.

We are not prone to be frightened or shocked at mere words. Thank Heaven, we have strong nerves, and can bear much; but we regard Pantheism as an error of no less magnitude than Atheism itself, and consequently must earnestly protest against every tendency to it. God and the universe are in the most intimate relation, but that relation is one of cause and effect, not of identity; and while we admit that there is this identity running through all nature, to which Mr. Emerson points us, we also contend that there is a corresponding diversity to which he does not point us. We complain not of him for not doing this, but we note the fact in order to warn our readers against taking his utterances as complete expositions of the universe. He brings up one pole of truth, the one which has been too much depressed; but in bringing up that he is not sufficiently heedful not to depress equally the other. We have revolted against exclusive materialism; let us be careful not to fall now into exclusive spiritualism; we have protested against Atheism and irreligion, or the forms of religion which were in fact no religion, and we should look to it that we do not now swallow up all diversity in unity, and man and the universe in God. The latter error would turn out to be as fatal to piety and morals as the former.

But after all, we have no serious apprehensions on this score. Ideal Pantheism, though a fatal error, is not one into which our countrymen are likely to fall, at least to any great extent. Only a few of the cultivated, the refined, the speculative, the idle, and contemplative, are exposed to it. Men in active business, taking their part in the rough and tumble of life, coming in daily contact with one another in the market, the hustings, the legislative halls, scrambling for power or place, wealth or distinction, have little leisure, less inclination, and still less aptitude for that order of thought which ends in the denial of matter, and of the universe as distinguished from its Creator. The cast of their minds

is too practical, and they are of too sturdy, too robust a make to find anything satisfactory in so refined a spiritualism. Their daily habits and pursuits demand a solid earth on which to work, a providence to protect them, a sovereign to rule over them, a real God to curb their headstrong violence, and to reduce them to order and peace, to chastise them for their errors, and to solace them in their afflictions. The practical tendencies of our countrymen will save them from all danger they would be likely to incur from speculative refinements like those we have pointed out; and we are not sure but Mr. Emerson's strong statements are needed to rectify their over-attachment to the material order.

As it concerns the ethical doctrines implied rather than set forth in these Essays, we have nothing to add to the remarks we have heretofore made on the same subject.* Mr. Emerson's moral philosophy, reduced to its systematic element, belongs to the egoistical school; but we presume, after all, that he means little more by those expressions which imply it, and which have given so much offence, than that just self-reliance, that fidelity to one's own nature and conscience, without which it is impossible to reach or maintain a true manly worth. In this view of the case, his Essay on Self-Reliance is a noble and unexceptionable performance, and inculcates a lesson, which it were well for us all to learn and practise, — a lesson which is perhaps more appropriate to the American people than to any other Christian nation, for no other Christian nation is so timid in its speculations, so afraid of solving for itself, independently, the problem of the destiny of man and society. We regard it as decidedly one of the best Essays in the collection.

We did intend to quote largely from the book itself, in order to justify our criticisms, but it is not a book from which quotations can be made with much satis-

---

* Boston Quarterly Review, No. iv. Oct. 1838. Article, *Emerson's Address.*

faction. We could not select a paragraph that would not at once confirm and refute our general criticisms. We content ourselves, therefore, with speaking merely of its dominant tendency, as it appears to us. The book cannot be judged of without being read, and the best way to read it, will be to forget its metaphysics, and to take it up as we would a collection of poems, or of proverbs.

Of the Essays we cannot speak particularly. The one on Heroism is inferior to what we expected from its author, and falls far below the general average of the book. Those on Love and Friendship are beautiful and often true, but their truth and beauty proceed from the intellect and imagination rather than the heart and soul. They read not like the confessions of a lover or a friend. There are depths in the affections, into which the author does not descend, deeper experiences than any he discloses. The Essays we have liked the best are those on the Over-Soul, Self-Reliance, and History.

These Essays are, to a certain extent, democratic; they condemn all ordinary aristocracies, and breathe much respect for labor and the laborer; but it is evident, at a single glance, that the author is at best only an amateur workingman, one who has never himself wielded spade or mattock to any great extent, and who has viewed labor with the eye of a poet, rather than with the feelings of an actual laborer. His book, though apparently radical, contains nothing more likely to give offence to the capitalist than to the proletary.

One of the most serious objections, we have to urge against these Essays, is the little importance they assign to the state, and the low rank they allow to patriotism as a virtue. This is an error of our transcendental school generally, and results, we suppose, chiefly from the fact, that its principal masters are or have been churchmen, and, therefore, not over and above acquainted with practical life. Their studies lead them to rely on preaching, persuasion, advice, appeals to the reason and conscience. Their habits and position remove them

from the actual world, and its necessities, and keep them ignorant of no small part of the actual developments of human nature. Clergymen are usually able to give wholesome advice, at least, advice which will generally be regarded as canonical; but they are rarely gifted with much practical skill or sagacity. A deliberative assembly, composed entirely of clergymen, is usually a very disorderly body, and ill adapted to the speedy despatch of business. The members are all so enlightened, so wise, so good, so meek, and so conscientious, that ordinary parliamentary rules are rarely thought to be necessary; and the result is not seldom confusion, angry, disorderly debate, and no little ill feeling and ill speaking. This anti-political tendency of our transcendentalists is, therefore, easily accounted for. Nevertheless, it is a false tendency. Man, as we have endeavored to prove in a foregoing article, is to be perfected in society, and society is to be perfected by government. More, than even politicians themselves usually imagine, depends on the right organization of the commonwealth. The science of politics, when rightly viewed, is a grand and an essential science, and needs always to be held in honor. Much is lost by not making it a subject of more serious study. Everybody talks about politics, and yet there is scarcely a man among us acquainted with the simplest principles of politics, regarded as a science. The proper organization of the state, the true exposition of the constitution, and the proper administration, so as to secure the true end of government, are matters with which we, as a people, rarely trouble ourselves; and scarcely a man can be found, who can speak on them five minutes in succession, without betraying gross ignorance, both theoretical and practical. In this state of political science, our scholars are doing us great disservice by sneering at politics and the state.

As mere literary productions, these Essays must take rank with the best in the language. There is now and then an affectation of quaintness, a puerile conceit, not precisely to our taste, but it detracts not much from

their general beauty. In compactness of style, in the felicitous choice of words, in variety, aptness, and wealth of illustration, they are unrivalled. They have a freshness, a vigor, a freedom from old hacknied forms of speech, and from the conventionalisms of the schools, worthy of the highest praise, and which cannot fail to exert a salutary influence on our growing literature. They often remind us of Montaigne, especially in the little personal allusions, which the author introduces with inimitable grace, delicacy, and effect.

In conclusion, we will simply add, that notwithstanding the metaphysical errors to which we have referred, the Essays make up a volume unique in its character, and which all competent judges will agree in regarding as among the most creditable productions of the American press. It must secure to the author a distinguished rank among the more distinguished writers of the age. We feel ourselves deeply indebted for his present. We receive his utterances with thankfulness and reverence, and shall wait impatiently till he permits us to hear from him again. It is not often, that in our profession as a critic, we meet with a work of fewer faults, nor one that can better bear to have its faults pointed out; for it is rare that we meet with one with its positive excellencies. It is no ephemeral production; it will survive the day; for it is full of sincerity, truth, beauty. Whoso pores over its pages will find his soul quickened, his vision enlarged, his heart warmed, and his life made better.

EDITOR.

ART. III. — *The Secret of the Lord is with them that fear him.* A Discourse. By the EDITOR.

"The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will show unto them his covenant." — Psalm xxv. 14.

SOLOMON, reputed wisest of men, assures us, that the "fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom;" but

this, in the ordinary meaning of the word, is not true. Fear is an apprehension of danger, a dread of evil, or a want of courage. In either of these senses, no wise man fears the Lord. For what danger have we to apprehend, what evil to dread, from God, who is the father of lights, from whom cometh every good and every perfect gift, and whose tender mercies are over all the works of his hands?

By fear of the Lord, most people, I apprehend, understand a sense of their accountability to God, and of the certainty that he will punish them if they disobey him. If they will analyze the sense, in which they ordinarily use the phrase, they will find, that by fear of the Lord they mean fear of punishment. Hence, even pious men tell us, that they would take their fill of sin, did they not fear the consequences in the world hereafter. But fear of punishment is a low motive of action. No wise or good man tolerates it, much less enjoins it. It cannot make one a better man, or afford any general security that he will be, in his intercourse with his fellow-men, what he ought to be. It is the motive of a slave, not of a free man, and may aid in nurturing a race of cowards, but not of high-minded men, who feel and dare assert their own personal rights and dignity. It doubtless has its place, and its uses in the economy of providence; but it is by no means the most proper feeling for us to indulge towards our heavenly Father. The truly religious man can always say,

> "God, I would fear thee though I feared not hell,
> And love thee though I had no hopes of heaven."

I do not understand fear, then, as used in my text, in its ordinary acceptation. In the scriptural sense of the word, he who fears the Lord is one who stands in awe of his majesty, reverences his wisdom, loves his goodness, and has an abiding sense of his obligation to do his will. He feels in his soul, that God is, and is his Maker and Sovereign, his Father and Benefactor, and that it is his duty to give himself up to God, to live and labor for God.

I say, labor for God; but, if I mistake not, people have somewhat vague notions about laboring for God. Formerly, to labor for God meant building him temples, performing the temple-service, endowing religious establishments, and sustaining and obeying the priesthood. But our obligation to labor for God, in this sense, is not quite self-evident. God stands in no great need of our assistance. He does not ask us to build him a house to dwell in, nor to provide him food and raiment; for he dwelleth not in houses made with men's hands, nor is he served with men's hands, as though he needed anything.

To labor for God, to serve God, is to engage with him, and labor to accomplish his divine purposes. We labor for him, when we work to the same end to which he works. He is a living power, and active energy, always working. The end to which he works is the production of goodness. He is Love, and his energy is ever the energy of love. In all he does he is diffusing himself, communicating his own divinity. Consequently, whenever we labor at the command of love, to diffuse goodness, to promote the good of God's empire, the good of the universe of being, we may with strict propriety be said to labor for God, to serve God. "Lord," say the righteous, "when saw we thee an hungered and fed thee, naked and clothed thee, sick and in prison and ministered unto thee?" "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me."

This is the great principle, of which we should never lose sight. We serve God by serving his children, by doing good to whom he does good. God is goodness; we serve him, therefore, when we serve the cause of goodness. God is love; we serve him, then, when we labor to enlarge, fix, and consolidate the empire of love. God is perfection; we labor for him, then, when we labor to perfect either ourselves or others.

I must be allowed to dwell on this point a moment; for, in most people's minds, serving God is a mysterious matter. To say the least, all is loose and vague. When the preacher exhorts them to serve God, they imme-

diately fancy that there is some mysterious or arbitrary duty for them to perform, for the performance of which no good reason can be assigned, save that God enjoins it, and will damn them if they neglect it. Their minds turn at once to some ecclesiastical work, to a religious profession to be made, a ritual to be observed, or a discipline to be undergone. Why the work implied should be done, they cannot guess; why God should love them for doing it they cannot imagine; unwilling to act without a reason, and unable to find one, they generally end in doing nothing; at least, nothing to the purpose. Now, the interpretation I give to laboring for God relieves them from these embarrassments, and presents them a plain, distinct, tangible work, which carries its obligation with itself. I need no evidence to convince me, that I ought to labor to promote the well-being of God's children, to diffuse truth, righteousness, love, joy, peace. There is that within me which supersedes the necessity of proof. The proof is immediate, irresistible, and universal. I may ask, What is love, truth, goodness? Never, — Ought I to labor for their promotion?

We can, in this view of the case, see our work, and know when we are doing it. It is a work growing out of the nature God has given us, out of the constitution of his empire; not a mere ritual, which the priests make or may unmake. The whole is summed up in a word; we are to seek spiritual perfection, to serve God, and show forth our fear of the Lord, by serving his children, by doing good to whom God does good.

This is the only way in which we can reach God. No man hath seen him at any time, and no man can see him; but we may behold his glory in the face of his Son. The Word was in the beginning, it was with God, it was God, God all entire; but became an object of knowledge, of love and worship, not till made flesh, manifested in a human form, dwelling among us, full of grace and truth. We worship the invisible in the visible, the Creator in the creature, the Father in the Son. No man who hates his brother, loves God, and no man,

who serves not his brother, can serve God, however punctual he may be in his observance of the forms of religion and piety.

God is not a mere abstraction; a speculative entity, but a practical nullity. He is absolute; the living reality, on which all beings depend for their existence, in whose bosom they are, and without whom they were not. But this statement does not meet the wants of the soul. Viewed simply as the ground of all being, the essence, substance of all life, the fountain whence streams the universe, he is to us merely fate, necessity, dark, inscrutable, overwhelming. It is only in his Word, his Utterance, Manifestation, that he is an object of love and adoration. I see his glory only as it shines in his works, or in the face of his Son. To my reason there is God the Father, the ground of all being, the fountain of all life, the creator and upholder of the universe; but to my heart there is no God, but "God manifest in the flesh." God, as he speaks to me in all sweet and thrilling voices, God that comes to me in all pure and gentle influences, that breathes freshness and power into my soul, in friendship and love. The God I worship must be embodied, must speak to me in a real voice, and show himself to me in a living form. Every embodyment of the true, the beautiful, the lovely, the good, is to me a shrine of the true God, at which I joyfully offer my heart's incense.

I hear much said about loving this or that quality, of separating, as it were, the attribute from the subject, and of loving the attribute only. But we never love the abstract. The abstract exists not for the heart. It is not goodness that we reverence, but him who is good; it is not beauty that we love, but the being who is beautiful. The heart never abstracts; it concretes; and discards the quality whenever it fails to embody it. The affections all clothe their objects with life and form, weave them, as it were, a garment of flesh. This, if I mistake not, is the secret of the sublime mystery of our religion, "God manifest in the flesh," the "mystery of godliness," which removes it so far from a

mere system of ethics. God shines upon us from all that is bright and lovely, speaks to us from all that is true and holy, lives to us in all that is living. I see him in the sun and stars, in the green blade and opening flower; I inhale him in the sweet breath and balmy fragrance of spring; I love him in the face and heart of my friend. All the true, the beautiful, the good, who speak to my soul, and entwine themselves with my affections, speak to me of God, are manifestations, and the brightest manifestations of the Godhead. Man is the Shekinah of God. It is not strange, then, that they who denied the divinity of the Son, should have been regarded by the Church as the virtual deniers of the Father. They do deny the Father, so far forth as he exists as an object of worship.

The error of the Church has been in not generalizing the truth she has contended for, in separating one visible manifestation of the Divinity from all connexion with others, who differ from that one only as one star differs from another in glory. The Church has contended for a general truth, a truth of all times, and of all worlds; but she has regarded it as a special truth, a truth in relation to one individual only. By this she has shorn it of its glory, almost lost sight of it, and entirely concealed it from the great mass of mankind. Nevertheless, she has held fast to it, and that is her praise. She will one day comprehend it better, and then we shall not be called upon to seek the living among the dead.

Our Protestant churches have misconceived this truth to an altogether greater extent than the Catholic church has done. They have driven the Divinity out of his works, and placed him beyond the reach of the heart, almost beyond the reach of the reason itself. But the Catholic church, in permitting the invocation of saints, and the worship of the Virgin, blest mother of God, has recognised and given it, consciously or unconsciously, her sanction. We have done great disservice to religion by dethroning the saints, those brilliant forms, which symbolized to our hearts the beauty of holiness; and in denying the divinity of the Virgin, did we but know it,

we have robbed the Godhead of all its sweetness, the universe of its living, loving heart, and given as an object of worship, only a stern, frowning, forbidding Majesty, before whom we cannot stand, and from whose presence we shrink with awe and terror. Our advance on Catholicism has, in too many respects, been a retrograde movement towards Judaism, a substitution of the Jewish Jehovah, with his stern and awful grandeur, for the mild and beneficent Creator revealed by Jesus. If, in any other respect, we have advanced, it has been in satisfying the demands of logic at the expense of the heart.

But to return. To fear God, I have said, is to stand in awe of his majesty, to reverence his wisdom, to love his goodness, and obey his will. This, practically, resolves itself into awe, love, reverence of and obedience to moral rectitude. They who stand in awe of the right, who are governed by a strict regard to it, who are always moved by pure and holy feeling, and exert themselves continually, with the whole energy of their being, to establish, extend, and consolidate the empire of righteousness, truth, love, peace, in their own souls and among their fellow-men, and who would shrink from the bare thought of doing otherwise, are those who, in a scriptural sense, may be said to fear the Lord, and in the language of my text, "the secret of the Lord is with them, and he will show unto them his covenant."

The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; that is, they who love, and reverence moral goodness, and labor diligently and conscientiously for its diffusion, know God, even the secret things of God. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." This means more than that God will reward the pure in heart for being pure, or that the pure in heart shall see and know God hereafter. There is a necessary connexion between purity of heart and seeing or knowing God. The pure heart as naturally takes cognizance of God, as the healthy eye, of shapes or colors.

This may seem a rash statement, but it is true. To

see God, either in this world or the next, cannot be to see a visible shape, or bodily presence. Unquestionably, as I have contended, God to be seen and worshipped must needs be manifested, concreted in some form perceptible to the heart; but he himself has no more form or bodily configuration than the human soul, or to take a stronger case, than a thought or a feeling. The Jews were, therefore, forbidden to make of him any graven image, or to undertake to represent him by any likeness which could be produced by the chisel or the pencil. They might as well attempt to bring out of the marble or the canvass an image, not of the lightning, as it appears to our senses, but of its occult power or force, as an image or likeness of God. God has no form, or shape visible to the outward eye. He is in all forms and all shapes, but is none of them.

But God is nevertheless visible to the spiritual eye, and may be as positively known as any object of knowledge whatever. Thought has no form or shape, but what is more cognizable? You know your own thoughts, take them as objects of new thoughts, and make them the subject-matter of discourse. You at this moment take cognizance of my thoughts. My thoughts are now passing from my mind to yours. You perceive them with none of your outward senses; nevertheless, you take note of them, converse with them, and are now comparing them with your own, in order to ascertain their worth.

You cannot see love, and yet you may know it, and recognise it as readily as you do your friend's face. Moreover, that which you love in your friend, is not that which your outward senses take cognizance of. One may say in sober truth, that no man ever saw his friend. Friendship belongs to the soul, and can no more be seen than the soul itself. Outwardly love cannot be seen, but whoso has ever loved knows it, and recognises its voice. Only they who have never loved are ignorant of love. So of truth, justice, goodness. We possess good feelings, we delight in certain feel-

ings, are averse to certain other feelings. The soul knows its own feelings, yet these have no outward, visible shape. The outward, visible shape then is not essential.

The way in which the soul knows a thought, feeling, or sentiment, is by possessing. It knows thought by thinking, love by loving. Two lovers understand one another, because there is but one spirit between them. Love is the same in them both. The soul of one, so far as love is concerned, knows what the soul of the other knows, because it is identical with it. Could we assume two individuals between whom the likeness should be complete, both intellectually and morally, we should find that one would know precisely what the other would. All that any man wants, in order to know all that another knows, is an entire sympathy with him.

In this same way we know God. God is love. We know love by loving, and know it to the full extent to which our love is pure and perfected. To the full extent then to which our love is pure and perfected, do we know God. God is holiness. The soul knows holiness by being holy; just so far as it is holy it knows what holiness is, and just so far it knows God. So may we say of wisdom, truth, beauty, goodness. We know God by having his attributes developed within us. When they are developed within us, we know them by our own immediate consciousness, and know them just so far and no farther than they are so developed.

We know God by possessing him. The pure in heart possess him, and therefore know him. God dwells in the heart of every good man, and is his goodness. He that loveth dwelleth in God and God in him. The wicked know not God, and simply because being wicked, he does not dwell in them; there is no sympathy between him and them. God is love, holiness, truth. But to love, holiness, truth, the wicked are strangers. They have no inward experience of them, and cannot be made to know them. No one can know love who has not loved. No description, howev-

er striking or graphic, can convey to the soul, as yet untouched, any conception of it. But when you have once loved, once had the sentiment kindled up within you, when once your hearts have been drawn to, bound to, intertwined with, nay fused into the heart of another, you know what love is, and know too whether he who speaks of it, speaks from his own inward experience, or from imagination or mere hearsay. Who again that had never grieved, never wept over the loss of that which was to his heart dear, beautiful, and good, could understand by the swollen eye, sunken cheek, heaving breast, broken words, sobs and tears, that heart-rending tale they reveal to him, who is a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief? Other examples, innumerable, I might bring to prove that we know only by possessing, or, as our religious friends say, "by experience;" but it is unnecessary. As we know love, friendship, justice, holiness, sorrow, grief, by possessing them, and only by possessing them, so know we God by possessing him, and only by possessing him.

We are misled on this point, because we take for God, not the living spirit, but the dead letter, the lifeless words in which we have sought to embody our conceptions of him. These words perplex us. We find God everywhere, we see him in all that is living, hear him in all sounds, from the gentle whisper of the evening breeze to the loud-speaking thunder, feel him in all just sentiments and pure emotions; but we do not recognise him, do not own him to be God, unless we find him marked and labelled, as an antique in a cabinet of curiosities. We dare not say to ourselves that he is God, the true, the living God, unless beneath the picture on which we gaze, we find the priest, in a plain, round, sacerdotal hand, has so written. Many a poor man has gone through the world fancying himself an atheist, while all the time he was one of the devoutest of God's worshippers. Definitions deceive us. God is the Indefinable. He cannot be compressed within a form of words. Always will he leap the bounds we prescribe; always he surpasses the utmost limits of

thought. Let us then cease to seek him in words, or fancy, because we find him not in this or that form of words, we find him not at all. We should have more confidence in our own spiritual discernment, and dare believe that all that we see and know of truth, beauty, love, goodness, is so much of God. Look deep enough, and you will find God everywhere. Look deep enough, and you will see God at the bottom of every thought, of every emotion. He will shine out to you from all nature, sing to you from all voices, and speak to you from all pure and noble hearts.

The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him. They who fear the Lord are the pure in heart, the upright, the true, the self-denying, the disinterested, the heroic, who wed themselves to all that is pure and lovely, beautiful and good, and follow it through good report and through evil, in life and in death, time and eternity. They possess, in themselves, truth, beauty, holiness, love; and to possess these is to possess God. Whoso possesses these knows them, and, therefore, knows God. If he knows God, he knows his relation to God, the secret of God's covenant, what God demands of him, and what he will give him.

The great practical truth implied in all this is, that we know by sympathy, and by sympathy only. God is unknown only to those who have no sympathy with him. Whatever we would know we must first love. Nature keeps her secret from all who love her not. She throws aside her veil only to the soul that loves her. She is veiled to whomsoever would scan her features for the sake of pointing out their defects. Go forth with an open soul, a genial heart, and she will meet you with a like open soul and genial heart. Love is the key to her mysteries. To love all is open, penetrable, living, radiant, tuneful, loving. To the unloving all is silent, dead; nature is a charnel-house, cold, and damp. Whoso sympathizes with nature gains her heart. To him a new world opens; to him there is no solitude, no desert waste. Blest beings everywhere hover over him, come to him in the glad thoughts of

his waking, and the sweet visions of his sleeping. The spirits sing to him, angel voices everywhere greet him, soothe him, inspire him, wake the music of his own soul, and dissolve the universe in melody. Would we know God, nature, man, we must place ourselves in harmony with them, yield to their influences, and entwine our affections with theirs; we must grow into what we would know. We must be heroic to know the hero; we must throw off the artificial, and become one with nature to know nature; and to know God, we must, as it were, become God.

Knowledge and wickedness go not together. The truly intellectual man is always a great and a good man. Whoso has penetrated into the mysteries of the universe has done it only on the condition of placing himself in harmony with its laws, or, in other words, with the will of its Creator. He has in him an open soul, a loving heart, a genial sympathy, a nature which has an affinity for truth, beauty, and goodness. He is then a prophet, priest, king, a revealer of God, and a redeemer of men.

In seeking, then, to know God, do not begin by cavilling, do not begin with a dry, hard, dead, and deadening spirit. Be assured, that all you can ever know of God will be simply what you yourselves possess of him. Go neither into yourselves nor into nature with a critical, cavilling spirit, but with a broad, generous nature, ready to yield to whatever strikes your admiration or raises your wonder. Go with a hungry soul, that would take up into itself all it finds, that will let nothing that really is escape it. God will then reveal himself always and everywhere to your admiring, your reverential hearts.

Admitting this, I may conclude by saying, that as we know God by possessing him, and that possessing him is precisely the same with possessing moral goodness, truth, beauty, and excellence of soul, it follows, that the more we possess of these, that is, the more really excellent we become, the more do we possess and know of God, the deeper do we penetrate into his secret, the

more fully do we comprehend him. In order, then, to know God, which is life eternal, we are not to seek in books or in sermons for definitions, nor in metaphysics for theorems and demonstrations; but to go forth and work, go forth and labor to *be* true, good, noble, disinterested, heroic. You need not seek to name the Unnameable, to define the Undefinable; you need not seek to construct theodicies, nor to torture language into hymns of fulsome praise; but let your own souls be your systems of theology, and your lives hymns. Be ye perfect, and your perfection shall be a revelation of God, your thoughts shall be praise, your emotions worship, your sentiments grateful incense rising in perennial fragrance to the Universal Spirit. Fear God, obey him, and you will know him, and your knowledge shall be his praise, and his glory.

Art. IV. — *Democracy in America. Part Second. The Social Influence of Democracy.* By Alexis de Tocqueville. New-York: J. & H. G. Langley. 1840.*

Hume, in his History, reign of Charles the Second, while endeaving to unravel the famous popish plot, thus remarks; "in one sense, there is a *popish plot* perpetually carrying on, against all states, Protestant, Pagan, and Mahometan." If to this we add its just counterpart, that a Protestant or sectarian plot is everywhere in a like state of indefinite progression, the proposition may be safely assented to even in this late and enlightened age of the world. The fell spirits of intolerance, bigotry, and proselytism, have never revelled more generally or more actively than of late. Even during the

* The Editor of this Journal inserts this paper on Catholicism, from a highly esteemed friend, without endorsing it. It is, however, worthy of a careful study.

singular era of British *puritanism*, there was not a closer assumed relation between social interests and religion, than we may now perceive in the Propaganda of Rome, and the Missionary enterprises of the Protestant church. The jesuitical spirit is still, as for long ages past, a considerable element in ecclesiastical affairs; and because God and religion are unquestionable truths, nay more, are innate feelings or deep seated passions of the human soul, while individual men are desperately selfish, there is little hope of a speedy extinction of hypocrisy. The artfulness of a sinister few will too probably long continue to control the weak through the honest fanaticism of the many, and thus pervert the aggregate piety of the world to the basest purposes of power.

At this day, and even now, in the United States, there exists much alarm respecting the encroachment of sectarian tyranny. Sermons, and more systematic treatises, by the devotees of specific forms of faith in abuse of others, stream from our pulpits, and public press. "Awful disclosures," from sources at least as questionable as were those of Titus Oates and Bledsoe, are devoutly obtruded upon the American public. The stigma of infidelity is bandied about with unscrupulous ceremony; and, indeed, attempted to be fixed upon an entire political party, comprising half the population of the Union. Church edifices of every species, are multiplying beyond all precedent; are extremely gaudy and expensive; and their erection seems likely to become a peculiar *trade*, the profits of which are to arise from the sale of *pews* at extravagant prices. Clergymen of particularly persuasive or convincing powers, are greater men, and more liberally paid than ever before. In short, the general aspect of church matters is such, that we have but to believe in the sincerity and single purpose of their active champions, to hail the long desired arrival of the thousand millennial years. We admit, there is abundant occasion for all this noise and activity; not so much, however, to supply an extraordinary demand, as to conceal the self-developing weaknesses and defects of the system. For

certain it is, that a formal Catholic and a bigoted Protestant, or any two contrarious sectarians, are necessarily bound, as by an imperious law, to scowl at and quarrel with each other, thereby to prevent a mutual and fatal paroxysm of immoderate laughter.

But not to treat lightly of a subject, to which the long duration and intensity of its controversy, if nothing more, give serious importance, we will now proceed to investigate the *nature* of Catholicism, and endeavor to draw from thence its probable progress and final result.

The subject derives new interest from the bold, and, we think, superficial views advanced by De Tocqueville, in the second part of his work on American Democracy. He there unequivocally asserts, that *the* Catholic religion is rapidly advancing towards paramount ascendency in the United States, and plainly associates its spirit with the generalizing disposition of our people. He observes;

"America is the most democratic country in the world, and it is at the same time, (according to reports worthy of belief,) the country in which the Roman Catholic religion makes most progress. At first sight, this is surprising.

"Two things must here be accurately distinguished; equality inclines men to wish to form their own opinions; but, on the other hand, it imbues them with the taste and the idea of unity, simplicity, and impartiality in the power which governs society. Men living in democratic ages are, therefore, very prone to shake off all religious authority; but if they consent to subject themselves to any authority of this kind, they choose, at least, that it should be single and uniform. Religious powers not radiating from a common centre, are naturally repugnant to their minds; and they almost as readily conceive that there should be no religion, as that there should be several.

"At the present time, more than in any preceding one, Roman Catholics are seen to lapse into infidelity, and Protestants to be converted to Roman Catholicism. If the Roman Catholic faith be considered within the pale of the Church, it would seem to be losing ground; without that pale, to be gaining it. Nor is this circumstance difficult of explanation. The men of our days are naturally little disposed to believe; but, as soon as they have any religion, they immediately find in themselves a latent propensity, which urges them unconsciously toward Catholicism. Many of the doctrines and the practices of the Romish Church astonish them; but they feel a secret admiration for its discipline, and its great unity attracts them. If Catholicism could at length withdraw itself from the political ani-

mosities, to which it has given rise, I have hardly any doubt but that the same spirit of the age, which appears to be so opposed to it, would become so favorable as to admit of its great and sudden advancement.

"One of the most ordinary weaknesses of the human intellect is to seek to reconcile contrary principles, and to purchase peace at the expense of logic. Thus, there have ever been, and will ever be, men who, after having submitted some portion of their religious belief to the principle of authority, will seek to exempt several other parts of their faith from its influence, and to keep their minds floating at random between liberty and obedience. But I am inclined to believe, that the number of these thinkers will be less in democratic than in other ages; and that our posterity will tend more and more to a single division into two parts, some relinquishing Christianity entirely, and others returning to the bosom of the Church of Rome." — Book I. Chap. vi.

An indistinct perception of the practical nature of our peculiar institutions, and, perhaps, a native prejudice in favor of the pomp and power, if not the principles of the Romish church, may sufficiently account for these opinions of De Tocqueville. His acute powers of observation convince him, that in the midst of the extreme "individualism," the isolated efforts at personal ascendency in society, there is at the same time an active tendency among us towards a general assimilation of character and belief. Limited in the more enlarged operations of mind by the excessive powers of his strong perceptive faculties, he believes, because he perceives the verging of extreme individual liberty towards a common sameness of conduct and opinion in the United States, and having long observed, and been familiar with but one specific form of fully developed Catholicism, he hastily assumes, that its characteristic features will become impressed upon the spontaneous unity of the American religion. His is evidently not a mind to discriminate accurately between appearances and reality. It does not seem to have ever occurred to him, that Roman Catholicism is but *one* form of ecclesiastical tyranny; a form derived from the contingent circumstances and events, which accompanied its progress to maturity. The character, too, of the people among whom it commenced its career, and the progressive action and reaction, as agent and reagent, of that

church and that people upon each other, has resulted in just such a church and just such a population as we find at this day in the various sections of Europe. The same original influence, if now acting anew on so very different a popular material as these States present, would certainly result in a species of church having little apparent identity with the Romish, or any other known Catholicism. De Tocqueville's anticipations are, indeed, nearly as absurd as to suppose the possibility, that by spontaneous operations among ourselves, or by immigration of Mahometans, or the industry of any number of agents of the Mufti and Dervishes, the Koran would come to supersede the Bible, and the adoration of the Arab prophet obtain in this country. We are in very little more danger from the cowl than the turban, the crucifix than the crescent. If any Catholicism shall here become established, it must assume a form as peculiar as is the genius of the people, or at least be adapted to the general spirit of the age.

While mankind are regarded as a mere cluster of *isolated selves*, without any other communal element than obscure, and, of a sort, accidental similitude of bodies and minds, and, consequently, while artificial regulations and laws are deemed essential rather than simply convenient, it is certain that Catholicisms, more or less perfectly matured, will continue, and will be spurious, changeable, belligerent, and tyrannical. Before the Reformation, the Catholic religion of western Europe was Roman; of the eastern, Greek; and of western and southern Asia, Mahometan. Since that period, other Catholic religions have become established; particularly, one in England, and another in Scotland. Indeed, no civilized country can be said to be without its peculiar Catholicism. Even in the United States, theoretically free as is the opinion of the citizen, both by constitutions and laws, certain features of religious exclusiveness are plainly discernible; for example, the observance, in some places by law! of the first day of the week as a holy day, the customary use of formal prayer in connexion with our legislative proceedings,

and the appointment of specific days of fasting, and of thanksgiving, by many of our governors of States. These practices, as involving controverted points of faith, are, strictly speaking, incompatible with freedom of opinion and conduct, and contain the characteristic element of the old Catholicisms. The fashionable use of the persecuting denunciation of *infidelity*, — which is always that of *heresy* in disguise, — is also indicative of a disposition toward coercion in matters of religious faith. We may go further and safely assert, that a system of social reputation, based upon sectarian fellowship, and pecuniary contribution to a certain limited class of ascendant Churches, has been carefully nursed into great practical strength. In some localities, it is well for the business man, that he appears to be a zealous Unitarian; in others, a Presbyterian, and again, in others, a Baptist, or Methodist. Catholicism in America is, indeed, much enfeebled by a multiplied competition between its own disjointed members, but the thing itself is in the midst of us; not in distinct Roman or Protestant guise, but simply, a *conservative* Catholicism; willing, perhaps, to become either Roman or Protestant, if society will but sufficiently retrograde.

A low ebb of general popular intelligence, amounting to sheer simplicity, is requisite for that measure of prejudice and moral dependence, which can subject a whole nation to implicit belief. In such a state of general feebleness of mind, the whole world has, indeed, once been; hence the institution of corrupt Catholicism, which, by the force of habit, and the indirect insinuations of early education, has been perpetuated, with a waning power, however, to this our day. It is safe to assert, that had all such schemes of tyranny been deferred till now, they could take no firm root in any portion of the civilized world. The people of America and Europe are now become too intelligent for the quiet reception of prescribed opinions on any subject of moral contemplation. The first distinct development of awakened mind is, that it cannot think and believe by authority; that it has within itself the perception, or

the revelation of truths. Thus it is, that the "individualism," which De Tocqueville so clearly discerns in the United States; that strong confidence in self, or reliance upon one's own exertion and resources, is precisely the antipodal principle of a tyrannical Catholicism. The strife of all our citizens for wealth and distinction *of their own*, and their contempt of reflected honors, their easy familiarity with persons in authority, or of eminence, of which this observer has seen so much, disprove, most effectually, his Roman Catholic prophecy. Nevertheless, he is only in error from defect of inductive power. There is *a* Catholicism, a pure and peaceful Catholicism maturing in these United States; but one which is as foreign to the Roman or any other olden form of a general religion, as light is to darkness. We will now endeavor to illustrate its chief peculiarities.

That a gradual generalization of religious views into two specific and antagonist creeds, will sooner or later take place as a due accompaniment of our political divisions, is, to say the least, not improbable. Sectarian creeds of manifold varieties, as they are now found in the United States, are, or are becoming, anti-American. They have, in general, had their origin and growth out of circumstances altogether foreign to the spirit of our institutions; and may be justly regarded, each according to its age and birth-place, as adaptations of Christianity, or, to cover all cases, adaptations of religion to governments and social conditions never known in America. As yet, they exist among us, by a sort of hot-house cultivation, with little change from their original characters; but because we have not yet made these things conform to the bold precedent established by our revolutionary patriarchs in the political institutions of the country, they will forever resist the genius of freedom, would be a vain and preposterous supposition. If our political institutions be true and right, they will certainly be lasting; and will make all other social and individual interests, at the least so far conform to them, that obvious discrepancies shall vanish. The citizen

will control the individual. The societies called the States will subdue all other societies and combinations. As all forms of the olden Catholicism received their peculiar characters largely from the political institutions in the midst of which they were matured, so the general religion of these United States must in the end partake of the essential features of the constitutions and laws.

But we have still stronger assurance of the truth of our proposition, in the NATURE OF MAN, as developed under the auspices of free political institutions. To this point the treatises of De Toqueville witness with extraordinary force. The effect upon man *and men*, of the combined circumstances, both natural and political, in which the people of our States have, for some sixty years, been fulfilling their singular mission, is surely a subject worthy not only of close observation, but also of the profoundest philosophical reflection. It is here demonstrated that man is capable of self-government. There is no longer room to doubt this important fact. If then, he be capable of self-government in a political sense, that sense which but one hundred years ago was universally regarded to be grossly absurd; is he not also capable of self-government in his religious relations?

To answer this question satisfactorily, it is requisite that we first ascertain the nature of, and therefore the proper distinction between, men's political or social interests, and their religious obligations. And here, it is due to the memory of a remarkable mind to say, that the late rapid progress of general intelligence, more particularly in America, bears convincing testimony to the truth of his theory of the nature of man; however strangely illustrated by his very peculiar talents. The *triple* constitution of every intelligent being on earth, which is an elementary principle of the doctrines of SWEDENBORG, can scarce at this day be denied by any individual who has looked within himself. That outwardly we are mere animals; that even the intellectual element, the region of opinions and professions, is not

fully *ourself;* and that behind or within all we say or seem, presides the ruling passion, the motive temper, the *real* man, are, we think, facts strikingly demonstrated by the whole history of hypocrisy and dishonesty, — which is, in fact, the whole history of individual and social man, — a history which seems about reaching a remarkable climax, in the celerity with which false reputation, false wealth, and, we fear, false creeds, shamefully called religions, are together marching to general ruin. If, however, the present apparent crisis in our social affairs shall prove not to be decisive, it is evidently an instructive indication, that the industry of the natural man, though stimulated to oppressive excess by the theories or *faiths* of his mentality, can result but in vexation of spirit, unless some hitherto obscured or suppressed element of his being, more profound than any of the attributes of mind, shall redeem society from its threatened dissolution. The great foundational error of this world evidently consists simply in this, that a *plethora* of mind has tainted every human interest, religious as well as social. The creed of the Roman, as well as of every other known Catholicism or sect, is as mere a combination of ideas and forms, as is the honor, respectability, or wealth of society. And surely, if the natural conservatism of opinion, — and fixed opinions are as stubborn as long indulged habits of body, — can scarce longer conceal the emptiness of conventional greatness, it must soon find a still harder task in preserving the imposture of conventional purity.

It is long since mankind have become quite intelligent enough to discard the mere animal attributes from their estimate of the human character. It may well be supposed that ample evidence of the intellectuality of the species was never wanting; but the will and the understanding, the feelings and the opinions, the soul and the mind, have always been confounded together. The will, comprising all the affections, and ever acting without deference to the understanding, will be best comprehended by the Swedenborgian de-

signation of the man, *homo;* while the sentiments and opinions belong to the man, *vir.* The affections, then, are those manifestations of active being, common to the race or genus, or which, in other words, indicate the *catholic* man. Of these there can be but two classes; the good and the evil; while the affinity of opinions, and the accord of habits, are of infinite variety, and ever tend to the grouping of individuals into petty societies and combinations. Our thoughts, which are always either sincere or evasive, — either truths or falsehoods, are easily communicated by one to another; but our feelings, though never so poignant to ourselves, are comparatively obscure to others. The soul, the simply catholic man, can therefore freely commune only with itself, or with the God who made it; unless we suppose, as we may indeed hope, that when the dominion of creeds, — the tyranny of prescription, — shall have passed away, some novel medium, either in an extreme refinement of poetry or eloquence, or acute sympathy of nerve, by which soul may act directly upon soul, will be evolved in the progress of time. If this were practicable now, the actual Church, — the final Catholicism, would promptly manifest itself; and until the kindly affections of men are allowed to commingle much more freely than at present, or than at any well known period of past history, all Catholicisms must be corrupt, because wholly artificial, and because of the heartless inventions and deceptions which are perpetually issuing from the minds of men.

An opinion, when reconciled to the predominant desires or passions of the soul, either frankly or only habitually, becomes confirmed into fixed belief, and is a part of the individual's faith. But faith, in its best and purest form, resides wholly in the mind. Even truth, which, in a certain abstract sense, we all spontaneously reverence, and justly associate with the general idea of perfection, has neither power nor value, and may be said not to exist, unless in due juxtaposition with active benignity. That faith only which comes from within by the prompting of love, and which is neces-

sarily informal, is profitable to man; while that which is from without, and prompted by fluctuating notions of expediency, may beguile the feelings of the recipient, but can never afford the genuine and heartfelt consolations of religion. A system of religious ceremonial which is instilled into youthful minds, and enforced upon a whole people, whether they receive it by education and habit, or by law, must be void of actual religion, because void of disinterested and productive benevolence. In America, men have become perfectly independent of each other in their creeds of political faith; there is nothing of this sort established by law or education. Nevertheless, there is with us abundance of *politics*, — of deep and abiding interest in the social state. Now, while this is certainly true as regards political considerations, it would indeed be matter for surprise if prescription were necessary or advantageous to religion. The religious relations of men, referring to peace on earth and imperishable glory, are of similar character, however superior to the social, which refer to the temporal welfare of a people, and the perpetuity of their personal and mental liberties. He who is conscious of possessing *both* soul and mind, and therefore, of being a consistent inhabitant of *two* moral worlds, can scarcely fail to recognise this important analogy, and to discern and love the universality of that law, which has already exalted the citizen far above the subject, and will assuredly so exalt the independent Christian above the subjugated churchman.

We therefore repeat: A peculiar Catholicism is promised to mankind. 1st. In the very nature of our political institutions. The general tolerance of religious persuasions, in the United States, has been supposed to favor specific dissentions from known creeds, and thus to promise an increasing complication of discordant churches, and an ultimate confusion and explosion of all. Out of such chaos, or during such disintegration, however, and simply because religion is an inherent want as well of human society as of the human soul, some novel form of a general church will assuredly

spring up, from the free operation of far more natural affinities, and with far less of the art expedient, than has yet borne witness upon mother earth. As the great experiment in human nature, which it has fallen to the lot of our favored people to try, has not only already proved successful in all its political features, but also evinced an unexpected capacity in man, — his containing within himself all that there is or can be of nobility and strength, so is he yet to demonstrate the self-possession of genuine veneration, and manly duty, to the entire overthrow as well of consecrated belief as of anointed power. 2d, and chiefly. This great promise is sustained by that modulation of all individuals' affections or feelings, which is, and must be, concomitant with the characteristic changes in the attributes of mind. It is already apparent that the stability of our political institutions consists not in any magic influence of law, nor yet in the force of education or example, but in a distinct perception of their beauty and rectitude, or in that deep-seated interest or love for them which essentially appertains to the citizen or freeman. There is then, in liberty rightly understood, or, as we would rather express it, in liberty sanctioned and strengthened by the affections, — which eminently implies the association of *order*, — a decided tendency to invigorate the soul; to submit the littleness of the individual to the greatness of the man, and thus eventually to convert society in mass into a true and triumphant church. But ere this tendency can be consummated, the present belligerent stage of angry controversy, and proselyting mania, must be endured for a while; for if we mistake not, ecclesiastical conservatism will prove far more stubborn than any other form of that general, however varying power, which steadily retards the progress of reform, — the development of man.

It is sufficiently easy to discover some of the more marked gradations, by which man, as he is developing in these United States, must come to absorb, so to speak, all the true elements of religion, as he already has those of the social relations. That incessant re-

currence of the individual to the inherent and profound resources of his own mysterious being, which De Tocqueville repeatedly certifies to be a prominent charicteristic of the American citizen, and by which we have lost faith in all traditionary institutions, and mere hereditary and transmitted worth, has, while urging "individualism" rapidly toward the extreme of refinement, nigh driven it into an organic unity of the collective race. Few, who at all reflect, can fail to perceive that it is the artificial classification of mankind, into certain unfounded castes of the high and the low, the learned and the ignorant, patricians and plebeians, priests and laymen, princes and subjects, — to say nothing of innumerable sub-genera and species, — rather than the free scope of personal or individual peculiarities, which has enfeebled, and thereby corrupted the race, and engendered the chief of those social evils everywhere so revolting to true moral sensibility. "Individualism" has its immutable laws, absolute and alike in each and all; which laws, when allowed to operate without let or hindrance, — however at first, and that by conflict with external influences and prejudices of mind, their effects may appear destructive and anarchical, — must, in the end, assimilate the species, and evolve all the glorious phenomena of original and eternal ORDER; — that order which exists in man himself, and alone vivifies and sustains him; precisely as it rules in universal nature, rightly circulating the ever intermingling elements, and perpetuating the vast unity of the seemingly incongruous mass.

There are probably but few of our citizens who have not occasionally had, in moments of abstraction, a more or less distinct internal perception of what man should be, and therefore will be, in the eventual subsidence of all artificial commotion. The GRAND MAN of Swedenborg, has indeed already appeared, or, in the progress of the great moral revolution now pending, will appear to all, a configuration, as one might say, in fancy, of general society according to the pure laws of genuine order; which, as they are common to all things, must

ever result in effecting a certain similitude to man, which is the similitude of God. In this one general being, — for whom alone there is a heaven above, and the heaven of heavens. for a mind and a soul, — each *vir*, as a constituent atom, must find his place. It is self-evident that only in some accurate arrangement like this, can the individual perfectly fulfil the whole utility of his existence. And it is equally evident that an associate arrangement, which will thus afford the precise place and office of every diverse individual, must possess essential harmony, and exercise only the simplest and purest attractions between its constituent particles. No crowned or mitred molecules can enter there. No specific agreements, fictitious claims, and spurious relationships can there hold good. Each atom alone, in naked and skeleton simplicity, without any sort of intellectual or ceremonial disguise, must take its place, and participate in common emotions and joys. And we would ask, is not society in this country verging towards a realization of this, if the reader please, imaginative sketch? It is. Royalty is gone, with many other fictitious institutions and relationships, which formerly were supposed to be indispensable bonds of the social union, and nevertheless, society not only holds together, but its members are happier, securer, better than before. The power of wealth is weakened; the influence of scholastic learning is despised; in a word, all the extrinsic qualities of men are waning away, and yet, society gains strength, because of a more than proportionate increase of practical information and general intelligence, and of the freedom and activity of the affections. In all these things there has been an evident progress among us, and new phenomena of the same kind will. doubtless, become gradually developed. As those which are transpiring in our midst are, undeniably, accompanied with blessing, we must infer that they sprang from a holy fountain, and will be followed to systematic consummation by others more wonderful and blessed than they. All, without an exception, of the old fictions of power, which have

been supposed to regulate the political, social, or religious relations of congregated mankind, must in due, uninterrupted series, give way to that great constructive work, which has here been so happily begun, and which must not, cannot cease, until the new moral temple be complete in all its parts.

To the religious interests of *man*, the principles we have now endeavored to unfold, apply with even stronger force than to the political relations of *men*. Religion belongs exclusively to the *homo ;* precisely as association appertains to the individual *vir*. Minds are certainly more susceptible of congeniality, or, in other words, are less individual, than persons ; but nevertheless, they can, at best, but associate or combine mankind into states and societies ; which, though not necessarily destitute of some measure of passable or forbearing accordance among themselves, have nothing in common of the pure element of unity. To the general and but too incongruous phenomena of this associating principle, we apply the term *social*, while it is to another and very distinct class of moral operations that the name of *religious* is given. From the earliest time, certain exercises of the feelings and affections, having an evident and strong tendency to system, have been recognised as the noblest attributes of Humanity. These feelings, the same in all men, and at all times, however they may fluctuate in particular or general intensity, can submit to no other classification than the good and the bad, — the religious and the reverse. Religion is not a loose external addendum to human nature, but lies deep within man and mankind. Its world, a world of liberty, indeed, is but covered over and obscured by the worlds of nature and of mind. The natural individual may full easily submit to coercion, slavery, and even beastly degradation ; the mental *vir* can be deluded by artificial imagery and sophistry ; but the *homo*, the soul, secure in its own quickened and very peculiar sensibility, cannot bow, and, all appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, never has bowed to any other supremacy than that of its Lord alone.

Thus, in the true order of successive character, the religious being of man has precedence in all things of the political and the natural; and, therefore, while in this favored land a manifestly improved decency has covered the general aspect of personal conduct, and mind has indignantly thrown off the shackles of the old social formulas, we may confidently assert, that the religious principle is duly gathering together its rightful and independent powers, to result in a glorious republic of the church, to flourish with, and be ever superior to, the republic of society.

As the restless intercirculation of persons, in the outward concerns of life, is in these United States, attended with less of jostling, and of the incidental disgusts of clashing ceremonials, than abroad; and in rightful accompaniment of this, the associating principle is now of unrivalled activity; so we may be assured that above all other people WE LOVE ONE ANOTHER. The deeper relations of the citizen with his peers are manifestly encroaching upon all conventional relationships; so that by correct observers, our "equality of conditions" may be discovered to have invaded, and considerably simplified, even the *family* association; the oldest, and very probably the firmest of the merely natural and legal forms of society. This gradation of our progress is agreeable to the feelings of the deep-seated man within us all; as witness De Tocqueville;

"Such is the charm of these democratic manners, that even the partisans of aristocracy are caught by it; and after having experienced it for some time, they are by no means tempted to revert to the respectful and frigid observances of aristocratic families. They would be glad to retain the domestic habits of democracy, if they might throw off its social conditions and its laws; but these elements are indissolubly united, and it is impossible to enjoy the former without enduring the latter." — Book III. Chap. viii.

Now, if we herein recognise, as we may, that the time is approaching, when no one of us will call another *father* upon earth, and he only our *brother*, who sympathizes with us in the inexpressible, though undisguisable workings of the affections, we may surely indulge the hope, that all other features of the one only

religion will be duly manifested and increase with this, so that true Christianity shall become identified with, and confirm our social institutions. This subsidence of the family relationship, or rather, this merging of it, as of a surreptitious speciality in the general vortex of communal interests, though but one of myriads of like sparkling indications issuing from out of the foulness of individual life, serves well to illustrate the progressive law by which a pure Catholicism will grow up in this land, and become the resultant feature, the great final cause of the many revolutions, out of which our peculiar institutions have been gathered together.

We may also here briefly point out, as important premonitory indications, the recent vast expansion of *Journalism* in this country, whereby that systematic book-trade, which is itself conservative and essential to conservatism, is threatened with utter annihilation; and the system of voluntary *Lecturing*, of late come into vogue, which bears the same relation to "regular" preaching, that independent journalism does to book-making; the one being addressed to, and of course controlled by a limited class of society, while the other is the property of the public at large. Even that pompousness of speech, and inflated style of writing, which De Tocqueville specifies as two of our more exceptionable characteristics, are consequential items of progress. It is certain that language, which has long adapted itself to mere *mental* conference, must, in some way, become applicable to far profounder communication. Our author well observes;

> "In aristocracies, language must naturally partake of that state of repose, in which everything remains. * * * * The constant agitation which prevails in a democratic community tends unceasingly, on the contrary, to change the character of the language, as it does the aspect of affairs."

We require a language which may convey emotions as well as ideas. It has been jocosely said, that speech was invented to *conceal* our thoughts; which, if understood as referring only to modern times, and to the concealment of the feelings and desires, is but too well

founded in truth. If vocal language be not susceptible of thorough reformation, or of keeping pace with the general progress, then will it eventually become an inconsiderable gift to man; and, perhaps, silence reign forever in the eternal church.

Finally, the theory of *constituencies* has here been gradually ripening into pregnant and prophetic meaning. The efficient embodyment of *many* in *one*, as their political representative, though once but an artifice, or trivial concession of unrighteous power, has with us approached to a reality, without diminution; but, on the contrary, with much increase of individual consequence in the state. Let any one ask himself seriously, to what extent this important principle may become spontaneously developed, and stop short, if he can, of an organic catholicism of the church, as well as of society. But specific proofs of the position we take are numberless, and their detail, if possible, would be unnecessary in a brief review of the general principles of human congregation. We may, however, remark, that all these things, as the visible ultimates of a radical change in the *moral currency* of the country, which has long been spurious, and which it has been attempted to *bank*, or control by select conclaves of conservatives, and but too successfully, are not only in themselves remarkable signs of the times, and conspicuous gradations in the progress of American society, but evidence the advent of a new order of communal passions, and of a diffused and practical intellectuality, of which they are but the first fruits. Collectively, all must result in the maturity of a very general, though yet unrecognised faith, alike destitute of superstition and ceremonial obedience, and wholly based on that *voluntary principle*, that simple action of the feelings and affections, which is ever sought to be controlled by all manner of mental devices, even on the part of those who most profess to approve it.

There is, then, no growth of infidelity in this country; no tendency to materialism, but directly the reverse. The feeling is becoming more and more gen-

eral and vivid, that as it was the *homo*, by its submission to the deceptions and beguilements of the *vir*, that originally prostrated the true dignity of man; so also, by the institution of another manliness, by a regeneration of the *homo*, in a majority of the constituent members of society, as well as in the collective whole of the GRAND MAN, is life, innocence, and virtue restored to mankind. It is not possible, that *this one* or *that one* man, or *this* or *that* little group of men, can possess exclusively the spirit of religion; precisely, as it is not possible, that a human heart can live without the viscera and organs, which together constitute a body. We may readily admit, that one organ, or component part, is more conspicuous, to us, than another; but a system and gradation belongs to the whole, which is totally at variance with the idea of exclusiveness. It is, therefore, MAN, in the vast unity of a complicate people, and by a due organic rather than homogeneous embodyment, that must eventually constitute the only church. The institution of this church, and its gradual, peaceful, but rapid progression to maturity, is amply foreshadowed in the onward march of our political evolutions. And while our beloved country, and, of course, in some measure, the whole earth, is thus witnessing to the diffusive nature, and future transcendent glory of the true body of the LORD, an important corollary accompanies the living demonstration, namely, that man must retrograde, and social liberty vanish from the world, to enable any of the old sects or Catholicisms to triumph over him.

V.

ART. V. — *The Religion of Nature Delineated.* Fifth Edition. London. 1731. 4to.

THIS is an old book, but none the worse for that. All that is old is in some sort venerable; and he who can look upon anything, over which has flowed the current of human affections, or rolled the tide of ages, without feeling his heart stir within him, is no true man. Hope in the future, efforts to work out a greater good for oneself, one's country, or one's race, do not require us to make war upon the past; nay, reform itself is often only a return to principles, of which, in our hurry and confusion, we had lost sight, and to the simplicity and open-heartedness, from which we did unwisely to depart. There is always hope of a man who has not lost all his reverence for what has been. He retains still somewhat of the child, and may grow in wisdom, in favor with God and with man. There is hope too of the age that goes back and explores the bygone, studies to get at its secret, and labors to reproduce it in history and in song. It shows that it has some filial piety, some loyalty, and is willing to do its own work, without calumniating those who have placed it in the world.

In this matter of books, especially English books, the old is altogether better than the new. England has done little, one may say nothing, for the world of ideas since her "Glorious Revolution." Her contributions were made in a prior period, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. She struck out her theories then, and has since been principally engaged in the struggle to reduce them to practice. Her literature, since the accession of William and Mary, that is, since the inauguration of whiggism, has been poor stuff, or rather has had no stuff at all. It is light, flimsy, indicating on the part of the nation no deep spiritual experiences, no sturdy grapplings with the great problems of the universe; a thin, mechanical, steam-engine sort of life; with faith only in man's digestive organs, and hardly so much as that.

This old book belongs properly to the age which preceded the Revolution of 1688, the latter part indeed of that age, but nevertheless to a period when there was still some faith in the people, some fondness for, and some power of looking into serious subjects. It is worth a number of Hartleys, Priestleys, Benthams. Its author was William Wollaston, whom we must not, as many do, confound with Thomas Woolston, an alleged deistical author, who wrote against the miracles, and some other things. This Thomas Woolston, however, was not half so much of an infidel as he has been represented; he was a believer in many things, a serious sort of a man, with some insight, who had too much honesty to call that sacred which was not sacred to him, and which he could not, in any light he could view it, make even *appear* sacred. In his way, he tried to get some solid ground on which he could stand, and not feel every moment that it would slide from under him. Nevertheless he is classed, and rightly classed, with Morgan, Tindal, Toland, Chubbs, Mandeville, Collins, deistical writers, who flourished in England at the commencement of the eighteenth century, a superficial, narrow-minded set of writers, yet not without some respectable instincts; men who deserved a better fate than literary history awards them; and who have exerted a far wider and more lasting influence than we commonly imagine. England was always too full of cant, especially cant religious, to profit much by them; but they passed over into Germany, and have given rise to the Kantian philosophy and its consequences, not yet ended.

But William Wollaston did not belong to this class of writers. He was a sober, serious, religious man, never, we believe, at loggerheads with the church, though no bigot, — a quiet sort of man, amiable, modest, retiring; who went through the world injuring no man, making war upon nobody, trying to save his own soul by cultivating a peaceable and devout temper, and by purifying his heart and enlightening his mind. God, man, and nature were great and solemn facts to

him; realities, that were something, and had a meaning, if one could but come at it. He looked at them bravely, without hurry or passion, did his best to find out what they meant; and the result we have in this old book, which many have read, some have admired, and which will be found in our Antiquarian Bookstores for some generations to come, — at least we hope so.

William Wollaston, we have said, was a religious man. He was one of those old English writers who studied Plato. He, then, we may know, had a tendency to a spiritual philosophy, or as we say in these times, to Transcendentalism. The world was not a mere Appearance to him. Something lay at the bottom of it; and therefore it was no bottomless pit, not the Devil's world, but God's. He believed that if you would penetrate deep enough, you would find it resting on something solid, permanent, everlasting; nay more, that it was no chance-world, thrown together any how or no how, but a God-created world, made according to some plan, design; which plan or design was eternal and immutable Truth as it lay in the Divine Mind. Therefore in its transcendental sense the world was a Truth and no Lie. Therefore is it man's duty to conduct himself towards it and all pertaining to it, as if he felt it a Truth and no Lie, a reality and no fiction. Therefore, again, his ethical rule, act always according to truth, the truth of things. In all things there is a truth, find it out, and conform to it; treat everything as it is, and for precisely what it is. In thyself too there is a truth, discover it, and obey it. That is, be thyself, and not another, or a something else; be a reality, and not a fiction. Say in whatever you are, do, or say, that Truth is Truth and no Lie; Falsehood is falsehood and no truth, and I will none of it.

Moral philosophers have criticised this rule, and attempted to show that it is inexact, incomplete, or not sufficiently definite. They may be right; and yet we fancy they would be puzzled to lay down a better. "Act according to the fitness of things," says one. With all my heart. But wherein differs "fitness of

things" from "truth of things?" Is not that which is true always "fit?" Is that which is false ever "fit?" "Follow nature," says another. The false appearances, the shows, shadows, or the truth of nature; nature as a reality, as firm, immutable Truth, or as a splendid Lie? "Seek perfection," cries out still another. All very good. But wherein lies perfection? In being false to the truth of things, to the truth of thy own nature, or in being true to it? "Seek order; universal order, as the highest, the only good," hear we again. All well. But order, what is it, but conforming to the real truth of things; adjusting all particular truths to the universal truth? "Obey the will of God, and send philosophy about its business," enjoins the priest. Good still. But the will of God, is it a truth or a lie? What is the truth of nature, the truth of man, but the will of God? Is there any truth at war with God's will, any falsehood in harmony with it? After all, we see not but Wollaston's rule, like Aaron's rod, swallows up all the others, and upon the whole is as good a formula, if formula we must have, as we can invent or discover. It has the advantage of not being an *empty* formula. It has substance in it, and would, if obeyed, never lead to a false result. Be true, not false, a reality, not a fiction; be what you seem; treat God, nature, man, as they are; live a true life, not a false; according to the reality of things, not according to the shows of things. Get always at the heart of the matter. If this be the Devil's world and not God's, then treat it as the Devil's; if it be God's world, and not the Devil's, then treat it so, treat it and all that pertains to it as God's.

But be this rule metaphysically exact or not, we cannot help believing, that it would go much better with man, with all men, individuals and society, if they would adopt it, at least follow it, whether they consciously adopted it or not. The world is dreadfully given to lying. One would almost think, that men had come to a general understanding to give up truth altogether, and to use in its stead some painted semblance of it. As paper representations of gold are thought by some

to be far preferable to gold itself, so is it thought that the pretensions to truth are far preferable to the reality. Look at individuals; the last thing you shall get from them shall be the truth; and for the very good reason, truth is the last thing they get for themselves. Into the heart of whatever is to them a matter of concernment they rarely look; they see not the thing as it is, and for it they give you some semblance, at best only an outward hull, husk, or covering, when the kernel was what you wanted. Ever do they even for themselves eat husks with the swine. Go to them with the truth, they shall stare at you, as if you were a madman; and they will know not your truth either by sight or by taste. They have been living all along in a vain show, have lied so much, repeated their falsehoods so often, that they have even come in some sort to believe them, and to reverence the bottomless as if it had a bottom.

All this we may see exemplified in a thousand ways. Perhaps just now there is nothing in which men are falser than in their religion. Their faith is a no-faith; their worship a make-believe. Not that worship itself is to be condemned, not that the doctrines professed and contended for are not true. The falsity is not in the doctrines, but in men's pretending to believe them, and even persuading themselves that they do believe them, when they do not. The evil lies not in the fact, that there are places of worship, that men, women, and children congregate there, that the minister prays and preaches; but in the fact that all this is mere empty form, that men do not worship, that they have no heart in the matter, and are all the while only making believe. Far be it from us to say, that no true worshippers of God can be found in our churches. In the worst of times God reserves to himself seven thousand, who bow not the knee to Baal. But men have now lost, at least with us, their faith in religion, their faith in church-going. They do not regard the doctrines the church proclaims, as great and solemn realities, as awful facts, which a man should not listen to without having his whole soul stirred. They do not feel that what they

call divine service is an offering up of the heart, the solemn, awful sacrifice of oneself to the Everliving God. In it there is no devoting of oneself to the service of God, truth, duty, humanity, justice, mercy, liberty. It is a cold, heartless service, a mere mockery, which men hurry through, because they fancy it decorous to do so, because perhaps it is proper to do so by way of keeping the peace, because, — God save the mark! — it is setting a useful example to the poor, the less cultivated, the less enlightened!

Now all this is false, false as the bottomless pit. We assuredly mean neither to speak against religious worship in general, nor any form of worship in particular. True religious worship is the noblest act of the soul. When the soul truly worships it is in its sublimest state; it calls up and pours forth all that is noble, generous, loyal in its nature. The soul that never worships is a dead soul, not a living; and deserves not to be named a soul. It has abandoned its birthright, abdicated its divinity, foresworn its sweetness, and is a mere dry, withered, hard, dead, and deadening thing, as incapable of a worthy act, a generous emotion, a spiritual function, as a stock or a stone. Nor matters it so much what the form of worship is. All forms are good, so long as the worshippers themselves can find substance in them. It is not easy for a devout soul to express all that it feels towards the Everliving God. The emotions, which rise in a true soul when communing with the Invisible, are unutterable. All speech fails us, and our most expressive language is in general silence. The various forms of worship are the various manners, modes, through which the soul struggles to utter what it feels, and which it never but imperfectly utters. All true feeling lies too deep for utterance. When two meet who really love, they are silent, and leave their hearts to flow into each other in their own mysterious way. Words seem almost a profanation. Nevertheless, there are times when utterance becomes a necessity. The mode and manner of it, is a matter of little moment, if it be sincere, if, as far as it goes, it

express what is really passing in the depths of the heart. We therefore find fault with no man's form of worship; that is always best to any given man, which best expresses what is best and purest, truest, loyalest in his nature. The evil is in adopting a form, observing a form, which has no longer any significance to him who observes it; which has no longer any capacity of expressing what he feels. Then he is false, sincerity has died out of his heart, his worship is a mockery, and if he believes it essential, that God will approve him for it, he believes God is a Lie, and an approver of Lies. All such observance of the forms of worship is solemn blasphemy. In this sense they are right who tell us, that the prayers of the wicked are an abomination to the Lord.

Here is the falsehood in which our community walk in regard to religion, — a dry, hard, *un*spiritual community, wanting faith even in the devil; yet putting on with great solemnity the forms of faith and piety; making grimaces and genuflexions; garnishing the tombs of the prophets; speaking with a sanctimonious twang; dealing forth their condemnation in no measured terms upon the luckless wight, who, believing no more than they, has the bluntness to say so. Here they are, talking of the great utility of the Bible; of the blessed institutions of religion; the blessings of a preached Gospel; the shocking wickedness of Infidelity; the awful condition of those who are living without God and Christ in the world. Out upon this miserable cant. Look into their souls, and you shall not find faith enough to save even the soul of a musquito from damnation. Their very truths become falsehoods; and of all infidels they are the worst. Miserable canters, worshippers of mere forms, who think by fair words, and pious tones, to pave the way over hell to heaven, remember God is Truth, not a Lie; that no Lie can pass current with him; no make-believe supply the place of Reality. Be what you seem; either worship in deep, solemn earnest, which is best; or give up your pretensions, stand out, and say in just so many

words, without any circumlocution or reticence, what you now say by your actions, that this is not God's world, but Satan's.

Religion is the practical view which a man takes of his relations to the Invisible. It concerns the state of his soul, his inner man, out of which streams all that he is, whether good or bad. It is too serious, too solemn, too awful a matter to make a jest of. Whoso meddles with it at all, should do it in deep earnest, in sadness of spirit; engage in it as in a struggle of life and death. It is, when once it really comes up, the one all-absorbing question, and there is no rest for us till we get at the bottom of it; till we come out victorious. When, in the soul of any man, the awful question arises, How stand I to the Invisible? there is a downright earnestness, and intenseness of feeling, which, as fire the flax, consumes the hay, wood, and stubble of your vain pretences, hollow forms, and cant, and hypocrisy. Nothing then will answer but the truth, the real truth, God's truth. There can be then no pretending to believe. The world is giving away, all things are vanishing, he himself is sinking, and he cannot think of *upholding* this or that doctrine for the good of the community; he cannot talk of *upholding* truth at all; he feels, all over and within, tremblingly feels, that truth must uphold him, or he falls, falls — where there is no bottom. Then he does not fear that truth will fall through unless he sustain it, but that he shall fall through unless truth shall sustain him.

This earnest soul may attend church, may bring an offering and lay it upon an outward altar; but he does it not because it is decorous to do so, because he feels it necessary to countenance religion, support it, for the sake of order and good example; but because there is a necessity laid upon him, because he needs must go there on his own account, and would go there, though nobody went there; because he must needs worship there to relieve his own heart, and bring peace, serenity, and joy into his own soul. He goes there because he meets God there. It is with him a serious, solemn,

truthful act. But to go there as the world does is mockery. A man who can go into one of our fashionable or unfashionable churches, compose himself quietly to sleep while the minister discourses on the awful realities of the unseen world, and then come home feeling that he has been performing an act of worship, that he has a right to regard himself and to be regarded as upon the whole a religious man, a Christian, one of God's worshippers, is one of the most impudent liars we can conceive of. He is false from beginning to end, from top to bottom, inside and out, given over, as one may say, to believe a lie, be a lie, live a lie, that he may be damned. Stay at home, go into the fields, ride out for your pleasure, work in your shop, your counting room, or on your farm; anything by which you can act out any particle of truth there may be in you, is better, and less offensive to your Maker.

No man does or can overrate the importance of a preached Gospel. But this wheezy drone, this sanctimonious drawl, these rhetorical mouthings, which greet us from most pulpits, are the farthest remove possible from the Gospel. No doubt the words the minister utters are good words enough in themselves, and the doctrines are true enough; but the fact is, nothing is said, nothing is *preached.* The minister means nothing, the people catch no meaning. Had he comprehended his own words, had they meant anything for him, his own soul would have been stirred, and he would have stirred the souls of others. But it was all a form with both him and them, and which both were glad to get through with. This is what we complain of. This is the falsehood; calling that the Gospel which is no Gospel to those who extol it; calling that excellent for which they, who call it excellent, have no respect in their hearts. He who preaches the Gospel truly is in sober earnest. Out of the depths of his own sad experience, he speaks words of lightning, which rive and shatter the hearts of whomsoever hear him. His tongue is touched with a live coal from God's altar, and he speaks always with power, as one

having authority. Whoso can so speak, let him speak. There will be a whole Evangile in every word he utters. You will have no occasion to speak of the blessedness of his preaching. You will rarely think of his excellence. You will not praise him; you will curse him rather. But some how or other he will lodge a word or two in your heart, where they stick fast, and where stick they will, fight and wrangle as ye may; and you will soon find that you have business enough of your own to attend to, without concerning yourself with him. Never a true word fell to the ground. It lodged somewhere, and the world has not seen the last of it.

No doubt it is a blessed thing to have the gospel preached, to have Sabbaths, churches, public fastings and prayers, and all that, and much more; but there is that which is more blessed still, — TO PREACH THE GOSPEL, AND LIVE IT. Give us the thing itself, not your praises of it. These praises are rather dull when the thing itself is kept out of sight, and go far towards making one doubt whether the thing be at all. Show us the beauty and worth you talk of, and spare yourselves your panegyrics. If it be true beauty and worth, as no doubt it is, give yourselves no uneasiness; our love and reverence for it may be as great as yours, whether we adopt your mode of uttering them or not. Good people, you are quite too noisy about religion; a little more devout reverence, true religious feeling, and you would find silence your most expressive praise of the Invisible and Unnameable.

This same general falsehood men carry into their doctrines. We have said their doctrines are in general true. So they are. But the doctrine is not the truth itself, but the form with which the understanding has clothed the truth. All doctrines are then in fact symbolic, mere symbols of the truth. All the great doctrines of the church, no doubt, cover a great and sacred truth, essential to man's spiritual well-being; but it is that truth, not its doctrinal form, that is essential, that is needed. The true believer is not he who holds fast

to the form and bids you swear by that; but he who has taken the truth itself up into his heart and life. To get at this truth is what we call getting at the heart of the matter; and it is only by getting at the heart of the matter that we can become true believers. Yet our religious people overlook this; or if not, throw every possible obstacle in the way of your doing it, and fancy that God will love them and save them for holding on to the mere form, husk, hull, or covering. In this sense the doctrine is no truth, but a lie, and they hope to go to heaven for believing a lie. That is, they believe, practically, that the world is a lie, that God is a lie, and that salvation comes by lying.

These doctrines are emblems of truth; all nature is an emblem of truth; truth springs up in each blade of grass, unfolds in each flower, shines out in each star, peals in the thunder, flashes in the lightning, descends in the rain, falls in the dew, whispers in the breeze; but what then? You receive not the truth, unless you perceive that all nature is emblematical of it. The falsehood lies in the fact that you take the emblem as an emblem, and yet as emblematical of nothing. You see the shadow, take it as a shadow, and yet admit no substance of which it is a shadow. These doctrines of which we speak, people see clear enough, are mere husks, hulls, coverings, but covering nothing. The doctrines themselves stand in the minds of the great mass of the people for no great facts in their own experience, in the life of Humanity, or in that of the universe. They are seen and felt to be mere dead idols; and yet are they insisted on with tenacity, contended for with vehemence, as if they covered, for those who contend for them, great, universal, and permanent facts. This is the falsehood. These doctrines once covered great and essential truths. These truths remain, and are as essential now as ever. They shine out to some as clearly through the doctrinal forms the church has adopted as ever they did; but to the majority they are no longer symbolized by those forms. Those forms have become to them opaque, — silent, uttering nothing. To

contend for them is not then to contend for the truth, and the great mass feel that there is no truth *in* them, find no truth in them, and yet contend that God will damn us, that we are "damnable heretics," if we do not swear they are God's truth. Said we not truly that the people practically believe God is a lie, and that salvation comes by lying?

No doubt a man is sanctified only through the truth, saved only through believing in the truth; but before you call a man an infidel, be sure that you know what he believes. Perhaps, without your forms, he has after all got at the heart of the matter, and believes with all his mind and soul in the very truth once shadowed forth by your doctrines, and which would be shadowed forth by them to you now, were they to you anything but dead forms, mere hulls, that have no longer any kernel. He may, after all, be the believer, and you the infidel; than which stranger things have happened. If he have the kernel, he is better off than you with the empty hull. Get at the kernel; no doctrine is a truth to you, or the emblem of a truth, that does not cover for you some fact of your own experience, some real law of nature, or of providence, manifested in either the outward world or the inward; and to contend to the contrary is to contend for falsehood.

Into society and the political world we might go and find still further illustration of the general falsity that prevails. But in these the fact is very generally admitted. That the majority of the social institutions of all countries are based upon falsehood, founded on a lie, as well as the greater part of people's social and political conduct, will at this late day hardly be questioned. The Devil is a lie, and the father of lies, and he, we have Scriptural authority for calling "prince of this world." Moreover, we have heretofore spoken very freely of social and political falsehoods, and therefore need not to do it again. The echo of what we said last July, when treating of the laboring classes, has not yet died away. In passing to our conclusion, we would signalize one trait of honesty in the present dominant

political party. They claim more loudly than any other party among us, the name of democrats; but to their praise be it said, they have had the honesty to tell us that they claim the name, not for what it signifies, not because they are the true friends of political and social equality, but because they wanted to get into power, and to get into power under any other name, in this country, was out of the question.

But it is time to end our homily. Yet we cannot do it without taking a little notice of our literary friends, the men who speak to the public, whether through books or other mediums. They come under the general censure. They are not true men. They do not tell their honest thought, speak out boldly, without circumlocution or reticence, what they honestly believe. They do not believe in truth; they dare not rely on truth. Some of them are afraid that truth will make a disturbance, turn society topsy turvy, upset every thing, and dethrone God himself. Others dare not rely on truth for themselves; if they tell it, they shall lose caste, incur reproach; perhaps be exposed to suffering and want. Truth is unable to sustain them, and so they must appeal to falsehood! God is not able or willing to take care of those who are true to him, so we must call in the Devil to help us! Pitiable! Suppose it to be so; which is better, to be false, a base, cringing, sycophant, afraid to say your soul is your own, and have bread and butter, and say a gig to boot; or to speak out your own honest thought as a true man, and starve? Better, a thousand times better, to starve, being a man, than to live and flutter, having belied your manhood. To starve, — well suppose you do starve, what then? Is there an end of you? Has truth deserted you? Know that whosoever has had virtue enough in him to compel a lying world to deny him a place whereon to lay his head, and to compel him to starve, has had enough to render him immortal. He lived truth, a true life, and no true life can ever die. The words he uttered were words of God, which sound out through all space, and fetch their echoes from eternity.

Some eminent writers compromise the matter. They tell the truth, at least so that *they* and those who knew it before hand, can detect it in their words; but so that the uninitiated cannot; they for whose sole benefit they were called upon to tell it at all. This is an attempt to get round both God and the Devil. From God they demand wages for doing his work, — telling the truth, — that is, eternal life; and of the Devil they demand the good things of this life, for doing his work, that is, *not* telling the truth. They should be scorned by both God and the Devil.

But enough. There is but one course in any sphere of life, becoming a man, that is to be true to himself, to act out the truth of his own nature; in such way as he can, to bear witness to the fact that he believes in truth, is not afraid to rest himself on it, come it to his mind and his heart in what form it may. God has no enemy but falsehood. The Devil is no reality, he is from the bottomless pit itself, and he is the antagonist power to God. If we believe that falsehood can prevail over truth, the Devil over God, hell over heaven, and that that which is bottomless, resting on nothing, is firmer grounded than that which rests upon absolute reality, then we may continue our general system of falsehood, we may be false in our words, our deeds, our lives, for then the world were the Devil's, and our duty were to serve him. But if we believe the world is a reality and no fiction, that God is, and not a phantom, that there is something in the universe at all on which there may be reliance, then we should say avant to the Devil, cast all lies and lying behind our backs, declare that no falsehood can be a truth, and go forth with such hearts, minds, instincts, hopes, aspirations as we have, and in such speech as is given us, be it articulate or inarticulate, *doing*, or *being*, or silence, utter the truth, whatever of truth, though it be the veriest infinitesimal of truth, there may be in us. No matter what reception we meet. If the world treat us well, so much the better for the world; if not well, so much the worse for it. No harm can come to us. The God of

truth is with us, and we are children of the truth. We may be cast into the fiery furnace, heated to seven times its usual heat, but there shall be not so much as the smell of fire on our garments. Curses may be heaped upon us, our names vilified, our characters traduced, our bodies crushed, and our bones cast out to bleach under heaven's rains and dews; but the truth we had, and have, survives, works its own work, scatters in due time the Devil's legions, dissipates the mists of falsehood, and shines forth in radiance the God it was and is.

EDITOR.

ART. VI. — *Address to the People of the United States.* By JOHN TYLER. Washington, D. C. April, 1841.

IT is not our intention to enter into any elaborate criticism of this Address from the President of the United States. As an important state paper, it falls far below that of Mr. Tyler's immediate predecessor. General Harrison's Inaugural Address has been underrated, and unjustly accused of being non-committal. A President, on entering upon the duties of his office, ought not to be expected to go into a detailed statement of the measures or the policy he will recommend, or to which he will or will not give his official sanction. All he can do with decency, is to state his views of the principles of the government he is called to administer, and the spirit in which he proposes to administer it. This General Harrison did as fully as could be required. The fault of his Address was not in its no-meaning, but in its wrong meaning; in embodying in their exaggerated form, the principal errors which have obtained, or do obtain, in regard to the nature of the Federal Constitution and Government.

These errors may all be summed up in the one fundamental error of regarding the Federal Government as

instituted by, and resting on, the will of the majority; as a government which, in the words of General Harrison, "a breath of the majority has made and can unmake." If this were true, the some seven large States containing a majority of the population would have the constitutional right to govern, at will, the other nineteen. The local interests of these would rightfully rule, regardless of the diverse interests of all the rest. But it is well known that the constitution is not made by the will of the simple majority, but by the concurring majorities of the several States, and the government can never exercise, without usurpation, any power which more than one fourth of the States choose to withhold. Consequently, the government must, in practice, confine itself to what concerns all the States in common, and leave those matters and interests, which are peculiar to each, to the exclusive supervision and control of the State governments.

It was losing sight, for a moment, of this important fact, that led Mr. Madison to adopt the rule for determining the constitutional powers of the government, now so strenuously insisted on by the party in power. Mr. Madison, in his justification of himself for having signed the bill incorporating the late Bank of the United States, when he had opposed a bank on the ground of its unconstitutionality, alleged that a "power repeatedly exercised by Congress, and acquiesced in by the people, should be taken as constitutional." A more dangerous rule it is not easy to conceive of. If the stress be laid on the *acquiescence by the people*, it virtually abrogates the Constitution; for it leaves the majority free to pass any law they please, that the people will tolerate; which is precisely what the case would be, were there no Constitution at all. If the stress be laid on the *repeated* exercise of the power, it asserts that wrong by repetition becomes right. If on the repeated exercise *by Congress*, it claims for the simple majority in Congress the power of determining what the Constitution shall be, of altering or amending it, — a power which, according to the Constitution itself, belongs only

to the concurrence of the several States, or at least to three-fourths of them.

The adoption of this rule by Mr. Madison, we presume, accounts for the fact, that he is now the pattern statesman with those who could once hardly find in the English language words of sufficient force, to express their abhorrence of him and his measures; and the fact, that he is now the pattern statesman with these, should teach the old Republican, States Rights party, that they have too feebly protested against the rule to which he, in an evil hour, gave his high authority. Mr. Madison was a great and a good man, whose services to his country are not easily measured; but the injury he occasioned, in this instance, to the cause of constitutional liberty, is one from which we shall be long in recovering. It was indeed one of those mistakes, to which the wisest and best of men are liable in cases of perplexity and emergency; but it is one which the earliest opportunity should be seized of correcting.

Mr. Tyler and his party have adopted this fatal rule for determining the constitutional powers of the government; we trust that we shall, therefore, be pardoned for having entered our protest against it, as a rule which virtually abrogates the Constitution, converts the Federal Government into a government of unlimited powers, and gives to the simple majority, acting through Congress, freedom to pass any law they please, providing the people will acquiesce, and not rise in rebellion and plunge the country into the horrors of civil war.

Mr. Tyler and the party now in power, so far as we can collect, appear to believe that the great danger to our liberties lies in the "tendency of power to concentrate in the hands of a single individual;" and, therefore, that the evil, we should most studiously guard against, is executive usurpation and the extension of executive patronage. But in our judgment this belief of theirs is founded on a superficial view of the actual tendencies in our own country. They do not seem to us to have noted with sufficient care the wide differ-

ence there is between our confederacy and one of the small city-republics of antiquity. The tendency they dread is resisted by the vast extent of our territory, and its division into separate, sovereign States; by the diverse interests, and institutions of different sections; the multiplicity of rival candidates, with nearly equal pretensions and abilities; and by the general equality of our citizens.

No one man, however eminent his talents or his services, can ever succeed in commanding the suffrages of all the States. Always will there be entire States in the opposition; and one State, under our system, is always competent to bring the government back, in any of its departments, within constitutional limits. The danger, Mr. Tyler dreads so much, can exist only in small communities, where the interests are homogeneous, but where the population is divided horizontally, and parties are noble against ignoble, or rich against poor. There indeed rival parties may aid the concentration of power in the hands of their respective leaders, because each may find it necessary to do so in order to secure its triumph over the other. But with us parties are not and cannot be formed according to the horizontal division. The trial has been made, and without success. Our population is all noble; and though we have rich and poor, neither party takes in all the rich or all the poor.

Our population also has an innate jealousy of power, when exercised by a single individual, an hereditary hostility to it, which has come down to them from their ancestors, who warred against monarchy, to the knife, in the family of the Stuarts. This innate dread, this hereditary hostility to this concentration of power, which characterizes nearly the whole of the American people, is no mean safeguard, and deserves altogether more reliance than Mr. Tyler and his party seem disposed to give it.

Then, again, our Presidents are in the main simple executive officers. Saving a conditional veto, they are neither makers nor judges of the law. The President,

it is true, commands the army and navy; but he cannot declare war; he cannot unsheath the sword till the people, through their representatives, command him. He perhaps, in a certain transcendental sense, may be said to hold the purse, but he cannot open it or take a cent therefrom, till the law gives him leave, and tells him what to do with it. His usurpations, from the nature of the case, must be open, palpable, and therefore easily guarded against; and be they what they may, as they are always ministerial usurpations, they can always be remedied by a simple change of administration.

The real danger, to which our liberties are exposed, lies, we apprehend, in legislative usurpations, rather than in executive. Against legislative usurpations, our people are not so much on their guard; and these are always usurpations which receive the sanction of the majority; for no law can pass the two Houses of Congress without the consent of the majority through their representatives. The opposition to them comes only from the minority. They must then always be hard to resist, and still harder to redress. New elections, or the gradual enlightenment of the people, will not redress them; because they are demanded by the interests of the majority, and the majority will return representatives pledged to sustain them.

Legislative usurpations, furthermore, are rarely looked upon in the light of usurpations by the great mass of the people. They have the sanction of the majority, and it is no easy matter to convince the people, that what has the sanction of the majority, is or can be a usurpation. The prevailing creed of the country asserts, with scarcely any but moral limitations, the absolute right of the majority to govern. We also retain the memory of the struggle of our fathers with the monarchs of England, when all power, conquered from the monarch by the parliament, was thought to be so much gained to liberty. We go on the supposition, that all power exercised by the legislature, freely chosen by the whole people, is exercised by the people themselves;

and that all power exercised by the people themselves is coincident with freedom. We have not yet learned, that the people, taken as individuals, may be completely enslaved to the people taken as the body politic, or civil society; that to establish the absolute freedom of the people, as a body politic, to do whatever they please, is to establish the absolute subjection of the whole people taken as individuals. The ambiguity of the word *people* deceives us, and leads us to infer, that where the popular sovereignty is complete, there is absolute freedom, when in fact there is and can be only absolute subjection. But recognising always the popular sovereignty in the acts of the legislature, and identifying popular sovereignty with freedom, we rarely fear legislative usurpation, and in general suffer without alarm the legislature to grasp powers which it has no right to exercise.

Here is the real danger. There is a wide difference between popular sovereignty and true freedom, and the people as a body politic, as civil society, may be as tyrannical in their acts as any despot, and encroach on the rights of the individual citizen with far greater impunity, and with far less danger of insurrection, rebellion, or revolution. We regret that Mr. Tyler, when discoursing on the dangers to which our liberties are exposed, did not see proper to remind us that power could concentrate in the hands of Congress, as well as in the hands of the President, and that the true policy of the country should be to guard against this concentration in the hands of either branch of the Federal Government.

Our fears of legislative usurpations, so far as concerns the Federal Government, are by no means imaginary. The Federal Legislature is steadily usurping powers not delegated to it, and bringing under the action of the Federal Government matters, of which its framers never intended it should take cognizance. Already has it engrossed the chief business of legislation, and become in fact the only important legislative body in the country. If its usurpations be not checked, and

more effectually than they were under even the administrations of Jackson and Van Buren, it will not be long before consolidation is consummated. Mr. Van Buren's administration, as far as it went, was in the main unexceptionable; but somewhat deficient in boldness and nerve. The hand that guided had its cunning, but not quite all the vigor desirable. A little more of the rough energy of Jackson would have been an improvement. Nevertheless, the country may count itself not a little favored by Providence, if it do not long have to regret the defeat of that much calumniated administration, if it soon find another as good, as faithful to the Constitution.

We know of but one remedy for the evil we have here pointed out, and that consists in a hearty return to the fundamental idea of the Federal Government, to the States Rights principles of the old Republican party of '98; in understanding that our maxim, the majority must rule, can apply to the Federal Government only within the limits prescribed by the Constitution; that the Constitution is paramount to the will of the majority, and rests on the concurrence of the several States, each of which is, for itself, its own judge of the grant of powers it has made to the Union. This will prove a peaceable and an efficient remedy; and between this and complete consolidation there is, so far as we can see, no stopping place.

But although we regard the chief danger as lying in legislative usurpation, we are still inclined to regard the executive patronage as too great, as dangerous, and requiring to be curtailed. But here again we are under the necessity of differing from Mr. Tyler. He seems to fancy that the evil lies in the active interference, as *individual citizens*, of office-holders in elections, and therefore seeks to guard against it by declaring such interference a disqualification for holding office. He tells us that no man shall hold office under him, who takes an active part in politics. But the evil, in our judgment, does not lie in this interference; nor is it one that can be reached by Mr. Tyler's rule of non-interference.

The rule is itself a flagrant instance of its own violation. It is, to say the least, no mean stretch of executive authority. It strikes at the rights of the States, by presuming to say what part certain of their citizens may or may not take in their political contests. It brings the patronage of the government into direct conflict with the freedom of elections, by enabling the executive to control them by all the force derivable from men's love of office, or desire to share in government plunder. It enables him to make every office-holder in the land his servile tool, and furnishes him the means, if disposed to use them, of buying up every prominent political opponent he can induce to accept of an office, and thus often to distract, and in the end discomfit, the party opposed to his administration. Is there no executive encroachment in this? Is this the efficient way of curtailing executive patronage?

Then again, the rule is unequal, and will operate only on political opponents. No administration will ever dismiss a faithful and efficient officer because he uses his best exertions, as a citizen, to sustain it. Mr. Tyler could not have supposed his constituents would credit his assertion, that he would apply the rule equally to his friends and opponents. Has he done it? Has he removed any of his friends who held office under the late administration? Are we to infer that none of them took an active part in the late presidential election? We presume not; and yet we have not heard that any of them have been removed. Nor will Mr. Tyler remove any officer of his own appointing, however active or zealous a politician, if not found wanting as a faithful and efficient officer. No administration can afford to dismiss its friends for doing what of all things it most desires them to do; and Mr. Tyler should have respected the good sense of the American people too much, to have pretended to the contrary. He should have spared them at least that insult. For himself, though blessed with his usual "good luck," we can assure him, that long before his term of office expires, his administration may need the active and

zealous support of all the friends it can retain or make, whether they be in office or out of office.

Mr. Tyler's rule encroaches, also, on the rights of the man and the citizen. The man and the citizen are not sunk in the officer. An office-holder may do whatever he has a right to do as a man and a citizen, not incompatible with the faithful discharge of his official duties. In what manner he exercises these rights is no concern of the Federal Executive, for he is accountable for their exercise to another tribunal. To inquire how he votes, how many speeches he makes, or how much money he spends for electioneering purposes, is as extra-judicial, if we may say so, as it would be to inquire whether he lives in a framed house or a log-cabin, drinks hard cider or champagne, eats white bread or brown, and sleeps on a feather bed or on a pallet of straw. The relation between the executive and the office-holder is purely official, and no question transcending that relation can be rightfully entertained. If the officer neglect his official duty, he should be removed, not for taking part as a citizen in politics, but for neglecting the duties of his office; if he transgress the laws of the State in which he resides, he should be turned out, not for electioneering, but because every government is bound to see that its agents respect the laws of the sovereign within whose dominions they reside.

The rule, furthermore, is indefinite. What is interfering in elections, — "active partizanship," as it is called? He who goes quietly to the polls and deposits his vote, is an active politician, compared with one who votes not at all; and a partizan, for he most likely votes for one party or another. Shall the citizen be deprived of his right to vote, because he is an office-holder under the Federal Government? We have not heard this pretended. Where then will you stop? May not the officer, without forfeiting his office, tell his honest convictions to his neighbor on political matters? If not, you abridge the freedom of speech, a thing which no branch of the Federal Government can attempt without

violence to the Constitution. If he may tell his honest convictions to one man, why not to as many as choose to listen to him? If in one place, in one position, why not in another? Where then will you draw the line between simple non-interference at all, and the most active interference compatible with official fidelity, the laws of the State, and general morality?

But the evil does not lie in the part the office-holder, in his simple capacity of a citizen, takes in the politics of the State or Confederacy. The citizen loses, in general, more than he gains by the officer. The man who holds an office has, as is well known, almost always less influence when he addresses his fellow-citizens on political subjects, than he would have were he wholly disconnected with office. If he sustain the administration, he is regarded as personally interested in its success, as wishing to keep the administration in power for the sake of retaining his place; if he oppose the administration, he is regarded as ungrateful, as cursing the hand that feeds him, and so has little influence. That administration cannot be very oppressive, which keeps men in office who use their best exertions to overthrow it. In a word, an office-holder taking part, as a citizen, in politics, goes out before his fellow-citizens under disadvantages rather than advantages, and can rarely if ever, exert with the mass his legitimate share of influence. There is then no need of Mr. Tyler's rule.

The evil does not lie here, but elsewhere. It lies not in any interference of the officer, as a citizen, but in his *official* interference. No office-holders, except such as have patronage to bestow, can cause any portion of the evil; and those who have patronage to bestow, cause it not by voting, writing, or lecturing, but by bestowing their patronage, not with reference to fitness for office, but with reference to services rendered or to be rendered to the party. A collector of the customs, for instance, brings his office to bear on elections, when he appoints to office, or removes from office, with reference to these services. His duty is to select his officers with

sole reference to the public service, and he transcends the line of his duty when he has reference to anything else. Other things being equal, he may no doubt select his personal or political friends in preference to those who are neither one nor the other; but he interferes officially, whenever in his appointments he leaves it to be understood that the persons appointed, in addition to faithful officers, are to be also active partizans; or when he removes a faithful and efficient officer, who is not an active partizan, and appoints to his place one who is. The Supreme Executive, however, causes the chief part of the evil, and is guilty of direct official interference, when, on his accession to power, he removes from office those who had opposed his election, and fills their places with the most active and least scrupulous of his partizans.

The real cause of complaint seems to us to lie in the fact, that a change of administration involves a general change of office-holders throughout the country. Not because one set of men are turned out and another set put in, for in this alone we see no great harm; but because so long as it is so, office-holders must feel that their chance of retaining their places depends solely on keeping their party in power; and because office-seekers, — a much hungrier and more numerous herd, — must see that their chance of obtaining office depends on ousting that party, and putting in another. The effect of this is to bring into our elections elements which should always be foreign to them; is to make them contests for place, perhaps even more than for principles. Here is the evil. These removals, which make so much noise, do not disturb us; the public good is rarely promoted by keeping a man in office, who would be essentially injured by being removed. But any policy on the part of the administration, which has a direct tendency to bring personal and selfish considerations into our elections, should be avoided as much as possible. The stability of popular institutions, in a great measure, depends on the purity of elections, and on making them contests for principle, and not for place.

On this point the late presidential campaign should read us an instructive lesson, — a lesson which should be all the more deeply impressed on our minds and hearts, from the fact that a righteous Providence has already taken to their reward several of the prominent actors in it. The country can bear much, but not the frequent repetition of the scenes enacted during the last year by the present dominant party. Such demoralizing scenes as they enacted to the bacchannalian shouts of "hard cider," and "log-cabins," are poorly atoned for by their present extraordinary pretensions to piety and virtue. Mr. Tyler may well call upon the country to fast, not indeed because an infirm old man, who had filled up his three score years and ten, has been removed from a post for which he had scarcely a single qualification, but for the arts his party resorted to in order to win their victory, the falsehoods they circulated, the deceptions they practised, the low and sinister motives to which they appealed, and by which they were governed. A few more such victories, won by similar means, and it will be time for even the most sanguine among us to begin to despair of the republic.

We pretend not to say that desire to obtain office led to all the extravagant and mischievous proceedings, by which the present dominant party succeeded in raising itself to power. There were other and more powerful causes at work; there were men who wanted not the government so much for the sake of office, as to aid them in their speculations, to pay their debts, and raise the price of stocks lying dead on their hands. Here were the more active causes of that disgraceful scramble, which will hand down the name of Whig to everlasting infamy. Still the love of office had its influence, and served to swell the tide of corruption.

The remedy, the means of separating the scramble for office from our election contests, is far from being easy to find or to apply. It may perhaps be found, to some extent, in lessening the emoluments of office, so that they shall not be worth scrambling for. This would do somewhat. If office-holding should, in a

pecuniary point of view, fall below the general average of business, so as to demand a sacrifice on the part of the officer, it would not be sought after. But in this case could offices be filled by men worthy to hold them?

In addition to this, if consistent with an efficient executive, which we must always have, and with which we must not dream of dispensing, we may make the appointing power and power of removal the same; that is, in all cases, where the consent of the Senate is necessary to complete the appointment, it shall be necessary to the removal. The President should have only the power of suspending, during the recess of the Senate, such officers as may be unfaithful, inefficient, or incapacitated. For ourselves, we incline to the opinion, that the power of removal is incident to the power of appointing, and should be so regarded.

Furthermore, we might make all appointments for a term of years fixed by statute, and all officers during that term, — excepting those whose political opinions necessarily have a direct bearing on the administration, — irremovable, except for causes previously specified by law. The end we aim at is preventing a change of administration from involving any general change in the incumbents of office; to get rid, in a word, of the "spoils" principle, and with it the influence which love of office has now in our elections. If this be desirable, as we hold it is, we see not how it can be done without taking away a portion of the discretionary power of the Executive. As a first principle in political science, we should leave the executive as little discretionary power as is compatible with its efficiency. These two measures would take away the greater part of its discretionary power, not over appointments, but over removals, and give to the office-holder, so long as faithful and efficient, a certain independence of the administration. This would add much to the dignity of office-holding, and enable us to fill public offices with men of worth and independence, men who are reluctant to take an office, when they know that the first revolution of the political wheel may throw them out. In the ordinary

course of events, offices could not all become vacant at once, but successively; consequently, a change of administration could not involve the general change we have complained of.

The term of years should unquestionably be short, not exceeding four years at most, because all offices ought to be frequently vacated, so as to prevent the growth of corruption, and to give the appointing power an opportunity of making such changes in regard to their incumbents as the public good may seem to require. New appointments, however, should be made at the pleasure of the appointing power, from the old incumbents or from new applicants. In this way you secure the advantages of rotation in office, without its odiousness and want of legal sanction. Embody always in law that public opinion which you would have reign.

These two changes, it strikes us, will prove an effectual remedy for the evil we have pointed out, so far as in the nature of things a remedy is possible; and against them we are unable to discover any insurmountable objection. No doubt the members of the cabinet and the principal fiscal officers should entertain similar political views with those of the President, but these would in general be men who would resign in case of any wide discrepancy of opinion between them and the executive; if not, make them an exception to the general rule. So far as it concerns the great mass of office-holders, it matters not to the public, though it may to party, what their political opinions are, provided they are good officers; and good officers they may be, with one political creed as well as with another.

Some of our friends fear that these changes would impair the efficiency of the executive; if so, they ought not to be adopted. But unless we would have despotism, we must place some limit by law to the executive power; and no limit would, in our judgment, be too strict that should leave it room for the prompt and faithful execution of the laws. The inability to remove a faithful and able officer for a mere difference of opinion, when that difference could not interfere

with official conduct, it would seem need not impair executive efficiency; and beyond this we do not propose to go.

Others again, object to the interposition of the Senate in removals, on the ground that the Senate is an aristocratic body, and we ought therefore to be on our guard against swelling its importance, or enlarging the sphere of its action. We do not sympathize with them either in their views of the Senate, or in their fears of the aristocracy. We never, if we can help it, suffer ourselves to be misled by mere words; and these terms, *aristocrat* and *democrat*, have been bandied about so much, that they now stand for anything or nothing, according to the temper of those who use them.

Ever since the Senate had the audacity to place itself in opposition, on certain occasions, to General Jackson's administration, it has been, with some, a mark of democracy to stigmatize it as an aristocratic body. We are sorry to see this, as it evinces a tendency from which we have much to dread for our liberties. The nature of all popular masses is to make war upon whatever interposes an obstacle to the immediate realization of their projects. If their favorite executive finds an obstacle in the Senate, then it is, down with the Senate; if a favorite legislature is frustrated in its attempts to carry some popular measures by the executive veto, then it is, down with the veto; if the cry of liberty is up, and men are bent upon freeing the slave, but find the Constitution in the way of the kind of action they would adopt, then it is, down with the Constitution; human rights are older than Constitutions, and shame on the coward, who would be deterred from vindicating them by fear of a piece of musty parchment.

This is a dangerous tendency, and the one against which we should always be on our guard. The institution we would sweep away, because it is unfavorable to the realization of the project we have at heart today, may turn out to be the only institution by which we can realize the still dearer project we may entertain to-morrow. The Senate, which interposes a barrier to-

day to a popular executive, and therefore seems to be aristocratic, may to-morrow interpose a barrier to executive usurpations. This tendency, we speak of, is encouraged by many good men, because they confound what should always be kept distinct, — popular sovereignty and the freedom of the citizen. They call alike democracy, the absolute sovereignty of the people, and the maintenance of the individual citizen in all his natural rights. Their theory is, establish the first, and the second is secured. Hence, whatever opposes in any instance the popular sovereignty, is termed by them aristocratic, and unfavorable to liberty. We repeat to them what we never cease to repeat, and what we have ever occasion to repeat, that *between popular sovereignty and individual liberty there is a wide difference; and that to clear the way for the free, unobstructed dominion of the people as civil society, is but clearing the way for anarchy or despotism.* The people, as a body politic, are as supreme in this country as they ought to be. The liberty we should now struggle for, is not, strictly speaking, *democratic* liberty, that is, the liberty of the people, but individual liberty, or securing to each and every citizen the free and full enjoyment of all his natural rights. And this is to be done, not by shouting "aristocracy," or "democracy," but by wisely organizing the State, so that it shall have no power to encroach on the individual, but be always able and obliged to protect him. Liberty with us is to be carried out, not by the heavings to and fro of a lawless mob, but by the orderly workings of constitutional government. In this country we are permitted to seek no reforms but in accordance with and through constitutional government. Our first duty to liberty, to the inalienable rights of man, is to establish and maintain constitutional order. Consequently, every attack we make on the sacredness of Constitutions is a stab at the very heart of liberty.

With this view of the method we must adopt to promote true liberty, we cannot view with indifference the attacks which some of our friends make on the Senate.

The Senate is unquestionably a conservative body, and wo to the State that has not somewhere in its organization a conservative body. Without the conservative element embodied in the Senate, our Federal Government would soon fall to pieces. The Senate represents the States, in their sovereign capacity, and tends to preserve their independence. It no doubt now and then serves as a check upon the will of the majority; but this is one of its recommendations. It preserves the government from yielding to every burst of popular passion, and from being swayed by every undulation of popular caprice. It therefore gives stability and something of systematic unity to the action of the government.

The Senate is an essential part of the Federal Constitution, and unless we would destroy the Constitution itself, we should beware of throwing suspicion on it. For our part, we are satisfied with the Constitution as it is. It is to us a miracle of wisdom. We see clearly the hand of Providence in it, and we have a sort of religious veneration for it. We do not believe it needs amendment, or that we are capable of amending it. The less we attempt to alter or amend it, the better will it be for us, and all who are to come after us. Let us encourage then no disparagement of any of its provisions. Let us take it as it is, and make it the guide of our political action; and therefore let us leave the Senate standing. Destroy the Senate, and the independence of the States will fail to be recognised, the American community will become a consolidated mass, whom whoso can may ride by the grace of God, as king or kaisar.

"But the Senate is an aristocratic body." What then? Perhaps your State is none the worse for that. Solomon exhorted men in his day not to be religious over much; if he lived now, he could not fail to exhort us not to be *democratic* over much. We do little but scream democracy from morning till night, and from night till morning; and those of us who scream the loudest are by no means the truest friends to real equality. Aristocracy is a natural element of every society,

and should be recognised in every State, unless we mean by aristocracy institutions or doctrines, which create artificial distinctions between man and man, subordinating the many to the few. Whatever opposes the maintenance of all the natural rights of every citizen, should be opposed; but we are aware of nothing in the Senate, either in its constitution or the mode in which its members are selected, that makes it in the least more hostile to these natural rights, than is the House of Representatives; nor do we discover that the Senate has ever shown any more disposition to abridge the natural freedom of the citizen, than is commonly shown by our State Legislatures. We believe some of the most distinguished advocates of equal rights, the country can boast, are to be found at this moment in the Senate. If such men as Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Walker, Mr. Wright, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Benton, not to mention any more, are aristocrats, where are our democrats, in any sense in which it would not be a misfortune to be a democrat? It will hardly do to call a body, of which such men as these are leading members, aristocratic. That aristocracy which consists in the possession of eminent talents, in being distinguished by the performance of eminent services to one's country, is honorable, not censurable, and deserving of confidence, not distrust.

But we close. We have introduced this objection mainly for the purpose of protesting against the tendency in our community of which we regard it as one of the symptoms. We would warn our countrymen against this tendency, — a tendency of which they who are governed by it are in general unconscious. With this, we leave the suggestions we have thrown out, to go for what they are worth.

EDITOR.

ART. VII. — *Message to the two Houses of Congress.* June 1. By the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE present is the most important and interesting crisis that has occurred in our political affairs, since the adoption of the Federal Constitution. Governments, as individuals, are rarely able to extricate themselves from the fatal consequences of their primitive mistakes. But our government is now in a condition to do it, to abandon its past errors, and to assume a new direction, one in harmony with the Constitution and the true interests of the Confederacy.

The existing administration came into power under the most favorable circumstances. It had not to incur the odium of breaking down the fabrics of past error and folly; for they had been demolished by the two preceeding administrations, which for doing it had been driven from power. The ground was then already prepared to its hand; a glorious opportunity was given it of redeeming the country, and of securing it the blessings of good government. But from the first we have been compelled to ask, will this new administration prove equal to its position? Is it composed of men of enlarged and patriotic views, who can comprehend what is demanded of them, — of pure minds and pure hearts, who will not shrink from doing whatever is necessary to be done? Will they put the government on the right track, in the direction pointed out by the lights of fifty years' experience, and by the wants of a great and growing empire?

We asked these questions, we own, not without some misgivings; but we resolved to repose "a generous confidence" in the new administration, and hold ourselves in readiness to give it a cordial support, if it should prove itself at all worthy of the high trust committed to its charge. We have, therefore, waited not without anxiety for a development of its policy. That development, to a certain extent, we now have in the Message before us; and we must say, that all our doubts

are confirmed, and nothing, but the weakness of the document itself, saves us from the fear that the most fatal measures will be fastened upon the country.

From General Harrison we had never hoped for aught remarkably sound in policy or vigorous in execution, and we were not surprised that the Goddess of Liberty dropped from her hand the scroll of the Constitution as he approached the Capitol. But him an All-wise Providence early removed, and we may not, therefore speak of him as we might, were he still living, and at the head of the government. We are not his judge; we will not be his accuser; and we have seen nothing in his official career to make us his eulogists. He is gone, and while many weep, we say, peace to his ashes. We will merely add, that we think our clerical brethren, who have recently flooded the land with their fulsome eulogies, might have been as well employed, had they remembered that it is their especial vocation to rebuke sin, and praise only God.

From Mr. Tyler, however, we own, we hoped something more. We had been accustomed to regard him as a faithful disciple of the old Virginia school of politics, as a strict constructionist; and, though perhaps not a man of the highest order of intellect, as capable of appreciating a wise policy, and possessed of the moral firmness to sustain it. It was not then without some degree of satisfaction, that we saw him at so early a day placed, by the death of the President, at the head of the government. We felt that now the Constitution would be safe, and that if all the good we wished should not be effected, at least the evils we most dreaded would be averted. We would fain feel so still; but this Message puts it out of our power, and compels us to regard him as one of those men, whose apparent size diminishes in proportion to the height they are elevated.

The only redeeming trait of the Message, as we have already hinted, is its imbecility; but imbecility placed in certain positions never wants the power to do incalculable mischief. The policy it develops is, with but

slight modifications, the very policy which has hitherto proved disastrous; and it will require the President to give his support to measures which cannot be adopted without corrupting the government, and through that destroying the liberties of the people. If Congress shall sustain this policy, as we fear it will, the government will be placed in the same false direction that has hitherto defeated the intentions of its founders, and which it must, without the interposition of Providence, pursue for at least another half century; and before another half century can elapse, the country, under the influence of a mischievous policy, will be lost to liberty; the few will become so wealthy, the many so poor, and all so corrupt, that Freedom will disdain to dwell among them.

The Message is not very explicit, nor very consistent with itself; but we can make out, we think, its dominant tendency, and its principal recommendations. One of its recommendations is the repeal of the Sub-Treasury. On the policy of what is called the Sub-Treasury we have heretofore given our views at length, and will not therefore go into its discussion again. Nothing since the passage of the law has occurred to change our views of the policy on which it is founded, and we were not a little gratified to find that Mr. Tyler himself had nothing to allege against it, but the very questionable fact, that the people, in voting for General Harrison, stamped it with their disapprobation. But the people, in our judgment, have not decided against the Sub-Treasury. The party, which may be thought to have voted against it, did not vote against it in fact, for they were, so far as the immense majority of them were concerned, as innocent of any acquaintance with it, as the babe unborn. It was during the presidential canvass no uncommon thing to find a zealous Whig declaiming against what he called the Sub-Treasury, but it *was* an uncommon thing to find one that had even read the law establishing it. The fact is, our Whig friends during the late Presidential canvass, drank too much hard cider, and were too busy in

hurrahing for "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," to be able to investigate at all the policy on which they made war. That presidential campaign is a curious passage in our history, and will perhaps be read with some interest by the grand-children of those now in power. We are happy to find that the men, who a year ago sang the praises of hard cider, and encouraged scenes of midnight revelry, are now the ardent friends of temperance, and have set themselves at work in right down earnest to reform the inebriate. This augurs well, and foretells other conversions. After a night of debauch, men are frequently disposed to be moral, and do sometimes "fast and pray."

Another measure recommended to Congress is the establishment of a "fiscal agent" of some sort, which shall aid the government in collecting and disbursing its revenues, and establish a currency of uniform value. What this "fiscal agent" is to be, we cannot at the moment of writing conjecture. It is not to be a revival of what was called the "pet bank system," for that, the Message tells us, the people have condemned; nor a United States Bank, for that also the people have unequivocally condemned. What then is it to be? It must, we presume, be some kind of a bank, and a bank of issue too; for one of its offices is to be that of establishing a currency of uniform value.

As a fiscal agent we see not its necessity. The government has now, it would seem, as many agents for collecting and disbursing its revenues as the people ought to be called upon to support. Very few of these will be dismissed, whatever new agent may be created or adopted. It will then be only an additional burden to be borne by the people, — a new agent for plundering them, and all the more efficient, because it may plunder them without their being able to say, in all cases, when, where, how, or how much it plunders them. Is this its chief recommendation? There are politicians whose chief merit consists in their skill to devise ways and means to tax the people, without suffering them to know that they are taxed; but we

would fain hope and believe that the President is not ambitious of being classed with these. These politicians would take to themselves great credit, if they should repeal the Sub-Treasury, and thus save an annual expense of some twenty-five thousand dollars now paid out of the Treasury, though in its place they should establish a "fiscal agent," that should take annually a hundred thousand dollars from the pockets of the people. The reason of this is obvious. The twenty-five thousand dollars are paid out of the Treasury; but the one hundred thousand, though paid, are not paid out of the Treasury. In the first case, the people see and know that they pay, and how much they pay; in the last case they pay, but without knowing how much, or suspecting in fact that they pay anything at all. Banks are expensive things, and their expenses must be borne by the people. We must know then, how much this new fiscal agent will cost, — not the government merely, — but the people, before we can decide whether it will cheapen the expense of collecting and disbursing the revenues.

As concerns the establishment of a currency of uniform value, we must be assured that we have not such a currency already, before we can see the need of instituting this new fiscal agent. We have heard people talk about "the derangement of the currency," but in point of fact there is and has been no derangement of the currency. The eagle, half-eagle, quarter-eagle, dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, dime, and half-dime, are, we believe, of uniform weight and texture throughout the Union, at least pass current throughout the Union at the same value. There is no derangement in regard to these. Is there anything known to our Constitution and laws as money, as currency, except gold and silver? Everybody knows that the money, the *currency* of this country is exclusively metallic, and this currency has suffered no derangement. It is sheer folly then to talk of a fiscal agent for the "establishment of a currency of uniform value."

"But the paper money." — Stop there, if you please;

we know not the article. There is and can be under our present Constitution, no such thing in this Union as paper money. "But bank notes." Ay, bank notes are no doubt of unequal value in the market, and so are the notes of individuals. Bank notes are not money, but mere evidences of credit, paper securities, and we know of no possible means of preventing them from obeying the general law to which all paper securities are subjected. The credit enjoyed by bank notes will be very much in proportion to the confidence the community has in the banks themselves, and their means of redeeming their obligations, when and where the holders of them may desire. The proposition to establish a currency of uniform value, in the meaning of the Message, is to establish and maintain the uniform value of bank paper, — a matter as difficult as it would be to make the note of the Editor of this Journal, for ten thousand dollars, pass as readily and for as much in the market, as a note of the Messrs. A. & A. Lawrence for a like sum.

But suppose the thing be not in itself impossible, how will this fiscal agent effect it? Will it receive at par in payment of government dues, every species of bank paper, without reference to the character or means of the bank issuing it? So bold a proposition as this, we can hardly persuade ourselves any administration, though composed even of the late officers of the United States Bank of Pennsylvania, or their intimate friends and retainers, would for one moment entertain. Moreover, this would not prove effectual, if done. It would but remotely affect the credit of those banks situated at a distance from the points where the principal portions of the revenue are collected; and it could affect the credit of no bank paper beyond the proportion the government dues bear to the whole indebtedness bank notes would be used to discharge. All the dealings of the country are not with the government, nor the principal part. Consequently, the simple fact, that bank paper is made a legal tender in payment of government dues, has never yet been sufficient to keep it from depreciating.

But perhaps it is to do it as a bank of exchange. As a bank of exchange, we can easily conceive it may be so managed, that its drafts shall be accepted at par throughout the union. But, if the ordinary bank paper circulating where the draft is purchased, be below the value of the paper circulating where the draft is payable, the bank will charge the difference. In other words, if the bank notes which circulate at Charleston be three per cent below the paper of the Boston banks, the bank will not sell to a man in Charleston a draft on Boston, for Charleston paper, without charging three per cent in addition to the regular exchange. And this is precisely what would be the case, were the draft purchased of the private dealer. The late United States Bank rarely furnished domestic exchanges at a lower rate than they could be obtained elsewhere. If I have the specie at Charleston, then of course I can make my payment at Boston without subjecting myself to the three per cent discount. Then the bank will merely charge me the regular exchange, which will be a discount or a premium, according as the balance of trade is in favor of one place or the other. At most, the charge cannot exceed the expense of transporting my specie funds from Charleston to Boston. And this is precisely the case now. The exchanges are as easy now as they ever were, and easier too, owing to our increased facilities of transportation. We saw exchange on Savannah, or Augusta, Georgia, we forget which, quoted a few days since at thirteen per cent. If a man wished in either of those places to make a payment in New-York, and had in his hand the specie with which to make it, would it cost him thirteen per cent to purchase a draft on New-York? Of course not. The difference of exchange is the difference between the value of the paper with which he would purchase his draft, and specie where his debt is to be paid. This difference the bank, as a bank of exchange, cannot get over. We know no law of trade by which it could afford to take depreciated paper at par. Perhaps, howev-

er, our Philadelphia financiers do, and will therefore enlighten us.

Nor will it make any difference if the notes of the bank be used instead of drafts. Admit the notes of the United States Bank should be of uniform value throughout the Union, the difficulty would not be removed. For the notes of the bank must be paid for, and the debtor must pay for them, either in notes of other banks or in specie. To do it in specie will not, with a paper circulation driving specie out of the country, or locking it up in the vaults of the banks, be very convenient. It must then be paid in the notes of other banks. But these notes are below par. Can the bank then take them at par? How long could it keep its own notes at par, if it received in exchange for them depreciated paper? If its notes could be bought up at par with this depreciated paper, for the purpose of making distant payments, it would soon be obliged to stop issuing its notes in all sections of the country, where the ordinary circulation was depreciated below that in the other sections.

Nor is this all. Suppose payments are to be made in the notes of the bank. These notes would be scarce in the debtor sections of the country, and abundant in the creditor sections. In the first they would inevitably bear a premium, and in the second be at a discount. Their own uniform value could not be kept up in spite of the balance of trade. So whether we look at it as a bank of exchange, or as a bank of issue, we see not how it can keep the paper securities of equal value throughout the Union. It certainly cannot do it, unless it drive all other bank paper out of existence, and then its own notes will vary as you pass from a debtor to a creditor section.

But perhaps it is to maintain the uniform value of paper securities, by the control it will exercise over the issues of the State banks. This control can never be complete. In order to be complete, it must at all times have on hand enough of the paper of the State banks to crush them, whenever it should demand its redemp-

tion; which would imply that these other banks were doing a large amount of business, while it was doing the whole. The extent of its control over the issues of the State banks can never exceed the amount of their bills, which it in the ordinary course of business would have on hand. This can never be more than a small proportion of the whole amount they keep out. If it is meant that it shall do the whole banking business of the country, that is one thing; then we need not talk about its check on the issues of other banks. If it is meant merely that it shall prevent the over issue of other banks, it can do it to no greater extent than we have stated. The principal control in this case, which it would exercise, would be over the issues of a few banks in the large commercial cities, but it would rarely be more than these now exercise over one another; and by making common cause with them, it could much increase theirs and its own over issues.

But enough of this "fiscal agent." Paper securities must be left to themselves, to follow the invariable laws of trade. Our error has been, not in suffering them to be used, but in attempting to give them an artificial value, and in confounding them with *currency*, which they are not, and never can be. What the advocates of the bank want is not a currency of uniform value, but some contrivance for dispensing with currency altogether. They know what we all know, that credits up to a certain point extinguish credits; they, therefore, wish to make them do it wholly, so that no balance shall ever accrue, to be paid off in money. But the fluctuations in trade between different sections of the same country, between different countries and different quarters of the globe, fluctuations in the affairs of individuals, death, casualties, losses by sea and land, fire and water, fruitful and unfruitful seasons, a thousand causes not necessary to enumerate, render this impossible in the present state of society and the world. Balances between man and man, city and city, country and country, will always accrue, which must be paid off before extinguished by the revolutions of business. Credits,

and evidences of credit, will always therefore vary in proportion to their real or supposed power of commanding money, when and where wanted; and this fact proves beyond all cavil the impossibility of maintaining over any considerable extent of territory, in a highly trading community, a uniform value to paper securities, to bank notes, which are after all nothing but evidences of credit. The only wise course for the government is neither to authorize nor to prohibit their issue. It should leave all species of paper securities to go for what they will fetch in the market; and, except so far as to guard the individual against fraud, and to enforce contracts, it should in no way or shape recognise their existence. While it leaves individuals free to exchange credits to as great an extent and on such terms as they can, it should collect and disburse its own revenues in money, in that which is recognised as money at home and abroad.

But we feel no disposition to renew the war against the bank. We have no faith in the banking system; we believe it necessarily false and mischievous; but the time is past when it was necessary to labor to destroy it. It is destroying itself full fast enough. Its doom is sealed, and there is no power in this country that can save it. The great mass of the laboring class are opposed to it, and, what perhaps is more to the purpose just now, a large proportion of the creditor class of the country are opening their eyes to its true nature. Only the debtor class, a class which is composed of desperate men, because in desperate circumstances, are now much in favor of it. But we trust the government will prove itself too wise and patriotic to labor expressly for these. The government always commits its most fatal errors, when it attempts to legislate for the relief of debtors. It follows, it may be, a generous sympathy, but departs from inflexible justice, and ruins itself and country.

But with the influence of the creditor class and the laboring class, both of whom are interested in a sound system of finance, opposed to the banking system, it

cannot long survive. No scientific state physician will attempt to restore it. Some quacks may try experiments upon it; steam it, administer it cayenne and lobelia; for they know that if the patient dies, they will lose nothing in reputation, since they can always say, it died because killed by "the regular Doctors." Doubtless we shall find many ready to revive the system, but they had better prepare to write its and their own epitaph. When a system is seen to fall to pieces by its own weight, it is folly to attempt to save it.

In connexion with the establishment of a fiscal agent for the government, the Message proposes the Distribution among the States of the proceeds of the public Lands. This is the pet measure of the party now in power, as the country will be able to see before this number of our Journal issues from the press, and the one on which it has staked its very existence. Without this measure all its financial schemes will fail, and it will be unable to fulfill, even in appearance, any of the promises it made while soliciting the suffrages of the people. Without this measure, it could hardly put a bank in operation were it to charter one. In these times of bank failures, bank suspensions, and of wide-spread and deep-rooted hostility to the banking system, a bank needs some solid capital as the basis of its operations. This capital just now can be obtained only from the government. Our capitalists have no money they wish to invest in the stock of a new United States Bank, and foreigners, after the late developments of Mr. Biddle's Bank, will be slow to take stock in another bank of a kindred character. Where then is the capital to come from? Government must supply it in the shape of a national debt, or of scrip based on the probable income for a series of years of the public lands.

The project is something more, we apprehend, than simply distributing the proceeds annually among the States as they come in. This sum would be too small to amount to anything. An estimate will therefore be made of the amount likely to be derived from them for

a series of years, and the whole amount be distributed at once in the shape of scrip to the States. This scrip will constitute a debt due from the United States, which can be funded, and made the basis of the bank. This we apprehend is what the president has reference to, when he speaks of making the proceeds of the lands the basis of the fiscal agency to be established. Of course no one dreams of the possibility of establishing a new Bank without first creating in some form a national debt. As distribution is to be the basis of the new bank, it is of course obnoxious to all the objections to which the bank itself is obnoxious.

Furthermore, this measure of Distribution we dislike, because it is, say what you will of it, assumption, in principle, of the State debts. Its motive is assumption, as urged by Mr. Tyler himself. He urges it because a portion of the States are in debt, and if not assisted must resort to direct taxation, or sacrifice their credit. If there were no indebted States, nobody would bring forward, at this day, a proposition for distributing a portion of revenue among the States. It is the only shape in which anybody among us dares propose assumption. Assumption is unquestionably unconstitutional. The debts of the States, incurred in their simple sovereign capacity, are their own, and the Federal Government has no more constitutional right to assume them, than it has the debts of France or Great Britain. This Mr. Tyler knows, and therefore repudiates the slightest approach to assumption. But can he not see that by distribution, he is doing indirectly, covertly, what he acknowledges he has no right to do directly, openly? How much more praiseworthy is a secret, subtle evasion of the Constitution, than an open and manly violation of it? We hold, we confess, in no high esteem those politicians, who think that the only honorable way to proceed is always to adopt measures avowedly for one purpose, but really for another. Honest and patriotic statesmen never resort to artifice; what they cannot do in an open, direct manner, they will not do at all.

We oppose Distribution because it is intended, as far as it goes, as a measure of relief to the debtor interest. We protest against special legislation in favor of this interest. Debtors can be relieved by government only by taxing for their especial benefit, either the laboring class, or the creditor class, or both. Now, we do not understand the justice or the policy of laying a tax on labor, on industry, prudence, and economy for the benefit of men who have outrun their means, and whose rash plans for growing suddenly rich have ruined them. The measure we are considering is proposed solely for the relief of the debtor States. Mr. Tyler says, "if distribution be not made in some form or other, the necessity will daily become more urgent with the debtor States for a resort to an oppressive system of direct taxation." The purpose then evidently is to relieve the indebted States. Now how is this to be done by distribution? The money distributed is collected from the people of all the States. If the indebted States receive as their portion no more than they had previously paid into the Federal Treasury, why collect it in the first instance? If more, the excess comes from the non-indebted States. The non-indebted States, that is, the States which have managed their affairs prudently and economically, are to be taxed to make up for the losses occasioned by the extravagance and folly of the others. Is this just? Is this sound policy?

The money to be distributed is revenue; it is so called by Mr. Tyler himself. This money has been collected from the people, at an average expense of thirteen per cent. If you distribute among the non-indebted States an amount equal to that which they have paid, you have of course no more to distribute among the indebted States than you had previously collected from them, minus the thirteen per cent, the cost of collection. Now, if you have so much surplus revenue, why not reduce your taxes, which would add to the means of the indebted States not only the surplus you propose to distribute, but the thirteen per cent, they must pay for its collection; for the distribution, we take it, will

cost five per cent at least, the average expense of collecting direct taxes. The people are thirteen per cent worse off, in these indebted States, after you have collected and sent back to them your surplus, than they would have been had you left the surplus in their pockets. Now, a system of financial operations occasioning a loss equal to this per cent is, in our judgment, worthy of adoption only by the financiers connected with the United States Bank of Pennsylvania.

The Message calls direct taxation "oppressive." But if it were not for the system of *indirect* taxation that now prevails, the president would as soon think of setting fire to the Capitol, as of bringing forward such a proposition as this of Distribution. If the people knew what is the fact, that they have been taxed for the money, and have paid the money out of their own pockets, which he proposes to divert from the legitimate application of the revenues of the government, he would not dare propose the measure he does; nay, meditating such a proposition, he would not dare look a single tax-payer in the face. We have no right to presume the ignorance of a Chief Magistrate of the Union; we are bound, in courtesy at least, to suppose that he comprehends the principles and measures he supports. We have then some difficulty in accounting, as we would, for his extreme horror at direct taxation, though it is resorted to by every member of the confederacy. Is it because he knows that where direct taxation is resorted to, there is a limit set to the extent to which the people can be plundered? that the people, if they know when and how much they pay to the government, will demand of it what it does with the money it collects, — a demand it, or its managers, are not always over and above willing to comply with? that, if not the most honorable, yet the safest way to plunder a man is not to meet him on the highway in open day, and cry, "Stand and deliver," but to come upon him in the crowd, or when he is asleep, and pick his pocket, when he can neither see who you are, nor defend himself? We would hope not.

The measure is censurable, because it strikes at the independence of the States. Mr. Tyler contends for State Rights, and he even counts so far on the simplicity of the American people, as to allege that the doctrine of State Rights demands this distribution. The doctrine of State Rights, we had thought, meant the entire sovereignty of each of the States composing this Union. In adopting the Constitution no State parted with its sovereignty, or any portion of its sovereignty. The Union is not a sovereignty, has none of the attributes of sovereignty. The sovereignty inheres in the States, and the Federal Government is merely an agency which the States have established by mutual compact, for the management of certain interests common to them all. It is not supreme over the States, but they are supreme over it. Now, whatever tends to convert this agency into a sovereignty, whatever tends to give it a control over the States in their separate capacity, or to render them dependent on it, or subservient to it, interferes with what we understand by State Rights, and tends to destroy the independence and dignity of the States.

The States have made the Federal Government their agency only for those interests which they all hold in common. In their individual character, it has no concern with them. They assess their own taxes, contract and pay their own debts, and carry on their own schemes of internal improvement. What they do in these respects, saving and excepting the matters they have placed by the Constitution under its control, comes no more under the cognizance of the Federal Government, than what is done in France, Italy, or Turkey. What should we say, if the President of the United States in his annual Message should recommend setting apart a certain portion of our revenues for the payment of the debts of France or Great Britain? Should we not say that he was travelling out of the record, going beyond his commission? Would he be treating those powers as free and independent? Would he not assume a sort of guardianship over them? And suppose that these coun-

tries should accept the boon, and come to be pensioners on the American Treasury, would they lose nothing of their independence?

The President seems to us, we are sorry to say, to proceed on the principle, that whatever is done indirectly is not done at all. The very proposition, to distribute the revenues of the Union among the States, is an assumption of superiority, of guardianship. It is saying that the States are incapable of taking care of themselves, and so we must take care of them. And when the States have accepted this guardianship, when they have become the pensioners of the Federal Government, we ask if their freedom and dignity are enhanced thereby? Has not the Federal Government subsidized them, is it not paying them a bribe to support it? They will then assume "an attitude lofty and erect," will they?

There are constantly occurring and ever will occur cases, in which State interposition in some form will be necessary to arrest the encroachments of the Federal Government. Nothing but the fear of this, on the part of that government, can be effectual in keeping it within constitutional limits. Will a State deriving from it the means of defraying its own expenses, a pensioner on the Federal Treasury, be free to interpose its State sovereignty? Nay, will it not, by all the force of the bribe it receives, be induced to enlarge the powers of the Federal Government, to extend its jurisdiction, in the hope of deriving from its action a larger share of plunder? That moment you make the States pensioners on the bounty of the Federal Government, you destroy the balance between the States and the Union, and give to the centripetal force an overwhelming power. How then can Mr. Tyler recommend this measure as favoring the independence and dignity of the States? The reverse of his pretension is the truth.

Nor is this all. Mr. Tyler goes for an economical government. So far so good. He must know, for he has been educated in an orthodox school of politics, that the party, to whom the government pays out what it

collects, is always a plunder party, that its constant study is to devise ways and means for taxing the people to the greatest possible extent; for the more the government collects, the greater the amount to be shared among them. The greater the amount to be shared among them, the more wasteful they become, the more corrupt and remiss in the discharge of their duties; consequently, the more corrupt and oppressive must be the government, the more prodigal and extravagant in its expenditures. Now, then, is it sound policy to bring forward a measure, which affords a specious pretext for raising the taxes, and therefore enlarging the amount to be shared by the plunder party? This party cannot be satisfied with the amount they can derive from the people for the support of the Federal Government, nor by the agency of the State governments, so they must make the Federal Government an agent for collecting taxes for the States, well knowing that they and their friends will share the plunder. Is this the way to secure an economical administration, and to make its burdens as light on the people as possible?

Nor does the corrupting influence of this measure stop with the government; it reaches to the ballot box. Mr. Tyler needs not to be told, that the people will pay much more in indirect taxes than they will in direct; we need not tell him, that the money they will receive from the Federal Treasury will seem to the mass of them so much clear gain, although it has cost them thirteen per cent more than it would to have paid it directly into their own State Treasury. This *gift*, as they will call it, from the Union, will appear to them to lighten their State taxes; because this was collected by indirect taxation, and State taxes are for the most part collected by direct taxation. Now let a man come forward and propose to repeal the law distributing Federal Revenue among the States, and he will not be able to command a respectable minority. His proposition will strike the mass like a proposition to impose an additional tax on them, to the amount received by distribution. The party in favor of continuing the policy

of distribution, then, can always command a majority at the polls. They have bribed the States, bribed the voters, and can therefore plunder to their hearts' content. This, we trust, is not the *reform* we were told to expect from this new administration; nor is this what was to prepare the way for those better times we were promised.

This measure, again, it is evident, cannot be adopted without resorting to a loan or to increased taxes. Mr. Tyler tells us the revenues for the present fiscal year, including the income from the public lands, will fall short of the expenses some eleven millions of dollars or more. Of course, then, distribution is not to take effect on an overflowing, but upon an exhausted treasury, to be made not out of a surplus, but out of a deficit. But he tells us that the distribution ought not to take effect unless it can without "imposing on commerce heavier burdens than those contemplated by the Act of 1833." This at first would seem to be a recommendation, that the measure should not be adopted unless it can be without resorting to increased taxation. But Mr. Tyler does not mean this; he merely means that it ought not to take effect unless it may without increasing the taxes from what they now are beyond the twenty per cent. ad valorem duty, contemplated as the maximum by the Compromise Act. He does not oppose the laying of duties on articles, such as wines and silks from France, now admitted free of charge, nor to increasing the tariff of duties on all articles now admitted below the twenty per cent. maximum. He therefore leaves ample scope for additional taxation. Now, a measure requiring an express resort to taxation for other purposes than to meet the wants of the government, looks to us wretched as policy, and wicked, when we remember the Constitution of the United States. Mr. Tyler knows that the income from the public lands is revenue, for he calls it so himself; and he knows, if he will read the Constitution, that Congress has no authority to raise a revenue for the purpose of distribution. How can he then recommend it? But we leave the

constitutionality of the measure, first, because we have too much reason to fear it is an instrument that has no weight with the present administration; and secondly, because we went largely into its consideration, as our readers will recollect, in our Review for April last.

By distribution a pretext is obtained for raising the tariff, and ostensibly for the purposes of revenue; but since Mr. Tyler admits in his Message the principle of discriminating duties, we may see that at the bottom of all this policy, our own old enemies, the advocates of protection, are at work. The scheme of distribution is resorted to, first, for the purpose of obtaining a basis for a United States Bank; second, for the purpose of raising the value of State stocks, and enriching those who have purchased them at a low price; third, to afford an opportunity to raise the tariff, and enable the manufacturer to obtain additional advantages over the producer; and lastly, to provide the ways and means of making the government a more efficient agent for plundering the people for the benefit of speculators, stock-jobbers, contractors, office-holders, and their friends; in a word, the party to whom government pays out directly or indirectly what it takes from the mass. Whether the scheme will succeed or not, it is impossible for us to say at this moment, though perhaps it may be told with tolerable certainty before what we are writing reaches the public eye.

There are several other points in the Message we would gladly touch upon, but we have not the room to do it. All we can say in conclusion is, that it is a dark day for the Confederacy, and no true patriot can look forward without fear and trembling. The enemies of true liberty are in power, and apparently able to do what they will. But the friends of freedom, of just government, — true enlightened patriots, though in the minority, are neither few nor weak. They will acquit themselves in the contest as men; what men may do, they will not leave undone; and if they fall, it shall be Antæus like, to rise renovated and reinvigorated to fresh combats. To the minority in Congress we now look,

and bid them remember, that they are now called on to defend Constitutional Freedom, and also that they are on the side of truth, justice, humanity, and a righteous God, whose providence suffers nothing to escape it, will not permit their labors to go unrewarded.*

EDITOR.

ART. VIII. — LITERARY NOTICES.

Hereditary Property Justified. Reply to Brownson's Article on the Laboring Classes. Cambridge: Metcalf, Torry, & Ballou. 1841. 8vo. pp. 51. — We notice this pamphlet because it is the only respectful reply we have seen attempted to the doctrines, we threw out sometime since on hereditary property, and because it is, we are informed, the production of an estimable young man, whose exertions to cultivate his mind and acquire a truly liberal education are worthy of all praise. We thank him for his pamphlet, which is serious and candid, displaying a cultivated mind and respectable talents. As a reply to us, we have found nothing in it that seems to demand a rejoinder. The author has hardly done himself justice. He can do better, and will, if he will take the trouble to look deeper into the subject, and seize upon certain ultimate principles to which his detached observations and reasonings may be reduced. A man to write well must not write from the surface inwards, but from the centre outwards. We have read the pamphlet very attentively, but we have not been able to ascertain on what ground the author objects to us; so we cannot say whether we are refuted or not. We must therefore be excused from attempting any reply.

We seize this occasion to say a word or two in explanation of the position we choose to occupy in regard to this doctrine of hereditary property. The community has been apparently not a little alarmed by our speculations. Their alarm, were we not of a serious make, would afford us much amusement, and perhaps has afforded us some; but now that the clamor raised against us has died into an echo, we hasten to say that it was wholly uncalled for. We never

---

* We have in this and the foregoing article spoken in strong terms of the policy the President has seemed to us to recommend. It may be that we have charged upon him the policy of his party, and assumed that he will support measures which he may finally oppose. If so, we shall be glad, and shall be ready to do ample justice to him; for we have always heretofore had a high respect for his character and views.

brought forward the abolition of hereditary property for the *adoption* of the community, but for its *discussion.* In considering the various means which were necessary for the real elevation of the laboring classes, we suggested, that it would ultimately be found necessary to proceed to the length of abolishing hereditary property, as had already been done in regard to hereditary monarchy, and hereditary nobility. We have as yet seen no very cogent reason assigned to show that we were wrong. We still believe that the equality, which many of our democrats are contending for, can be effected by no measure less searching and radical. But we knew well that these democrats would in general shrink from it; and one reason we had for suggesting the measure was to show, that the real elevation of the laboring classes was a work they were by no means prepared for. We were willing to expose their cant and hypocrisy, by showing them that they had by no means the nerve to look any measure in the face, sufficiently strong to effect the object they professed to have at heart. But we knew the measure could not be adopted at present, if ever; and therefore we never proposed to ourselves to embark in the Quixotic enterprise of attempting to secure its adoption. We stated at the time, that we did not propose it for adoption, that the time had not come for its adoption, and that we would be the last to bring it before the legislature. We therefore threw it out, as we said, merely for discussion, confident that its discussion could do no harm, and also that discussion would raise it up, in the long run, friends and champions. In this way we thought possibly it might after a series of ages come to be adopted. We have accomplished the purpose we had in view in bringing it forward; we have placed it before the public; made it a subject of thought; and, having said all we choose to say on it, we leave it now to make or mar its fortune. If founded in truth and justice, in some shape it will ultimately be adopted; if in error and iniquity, as the wise public say, it will of course sink to the bottomless pit, where in that case it would belong.

One word as to the elevation of the laboring classes. The manner in which our articles on the laboring classes have been received, while it gives us ground of hope for the future, and proves that the number, who really desire the elevation of the workingman, is greater than we had supposed, teaches us what we knew before, that the regard expressed for him is in general mere cant. It is fashionable to talk of his elevation, and to profess great regard for him, but the country is by no means ripe for the adoption of any measures that will give him an equal rank in society. The day of his redemption is not yet. It will dawn we hope. *En attendant*, all we can do for him seems to be, to labor earnestly for the establishment of a just and economical government, and especially of a sound system of finance, by means of which labor shall secure a larger portion of its proceeds. We see nothing else that can be *done* at present, except the free and full discussion of all principles and measures having or likely to have a bearing on the mutual relation of capital and labor. The measures which might be effectual are now so repugnant to prevailing convictions, that all hope of securing their adoption should be abandoned.

Names and Titles of the Lord Jesus Christ. By CHARLES SPEAR. Fourth Edition. Boston: B. B. Mussey and Abel Tompkins. 1841. 12mo. pp. 400. — This book would seem to be, as the trade would say, a successful one; for although it has been published but a few months, it has already reached a fourth edition. We have read it, not very attentively, but sufficiently to perceive that it is the production of a serious, earnest mind, disposed to religious reflection, and possessed of much genuine religious feeling. The book is rather a devotional book than otherwise, and is quite creditable to the industry, the acquirements, the intellect, and the heart of the writer. It is a book from which we doubt not many may derive much spiritual nutriment.

The theology of the book, however, is not in accordance with ours. Mr. Spear does not take that view of the Saviour, which after many, many years of doubt and inquiry, we have been led to take. He is not a Trinitarian nor yet a Humanitarian, but seems to favor what is sometimes called the Superangelic scheme. He appears to have shrunk from relying on Jesus as a man, and to have been unable to perceive the strict identity of the Son with the Father, and so gets for a Saviour a being neither God nor man. The doctrine of the two natures, it seems to us, would have saved him from this, to us, least excusable of all hypotheses with regard to the Saviour. The conclusion to which our inquiries have led us is, that the Saviour was very God and very man, and in him we see the union of perfect God and perfect man. The Christ is one with God, was God, and the Christ, the true God, was incarnated in the man Jesus, a true man, and type of the perfect man. Mr. Spear's error comes therefore from not being able to admit the mystery of the two natures.

The low view which he takes of Christ, and his want of true spiritual insight, may be collected from the following. "The word Christ is frequently used by Paul as a trope, denoting sometimes the Christian spirit and temper, as when he says, 'My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you.'" We have not been in the habit of regarding the word Christ here as a trope, but as used literally. We had supposed that Christ must be formed literally, not figuratively in us, before we could be Christians, and we are in the habit also of regarding the Christian spirit and temper as manifestation of the true, real indwelling Christ. The want of this spiritual insight gives after all a cold and material aspect to the book, forbidding and unsatisfactory to the man of deep inward religious experiences. We find much in it to commend, many eloquent remarks and much power; but we do not find our Saviour in it, the Son of God, one with the Father, through whom alone we can be cleansed from all sin, and presented blameless at the last day.

THE

BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1841.

ART. I. — 1. *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley.* Edited by MRS. SHELLEY. London: Edward Moxon. 1840.

2. *Essays, Letters from abroad, Translations and Fragments, by Percy Bysshe Shelley.* Edited by MRS. SHELLEY. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1840.

IT is much the fashion of this grandiloquent nineteenth century to boast itself as the age of free principles and enlightened liberality, when the human mind is left to walk forth unshackled in its native dignity, and man no longer dares to step in between the conscience of his brother and Him who made it. We refer with complacent satisfaction to our own time, so happy in comparison with others, and feel a thrill of indignation as we read the long and mournful records of persecution for opinion's sake. Our cheeks glow with shame and anger, when we recount the innumerable wrongs of the early disciples of the Saviour, — we sympathize deeply with the noble army of martyrs that suffered for the faith; — the Roman cross and the fires of Smithfield excite the same abhorrence, — and our very heart's blood chills at the recital of the enormities of the Inquisition. As one page of history after another shows some new attempts to enchain the intel-

lect and bind down the spirit upon the Procrustes-bed of a creed, framed by narrow dogmatism and enforced by sectarian bigotry, we turn from it with loathing, and thank Heaven that our lot has been cast in a more fortunate era. But yet it may be allowed us to doubt whether the great evil alluded to has been eradicated, — even to suspect that the old leaven still works, if more covertly, yet not the less potently. We have the outside of the cup and platter clean, but have we not, like the Pharisees of old, left them as foul within as ever? The sepulchre is whitened and stands beautiful enough outwardly, but is it less full of rottenness and dead men's bones? We may not stone the prophets, but it is to be feared nevertheless, that we sometimes persecute them that are sent unto us. It is true indeed, that the secular arm is not now called in to enforce uniformity of belief. The cross is cast down, and the rack is broken. The amphitheatre no longer resounds with the agonizing shriek of victims perishing in the grasp of wild beasts, nor does the dungeon open to receive the heretic in its living tomb. Maddened crowds are not now led on by an evil priesthood to massacre their brethren in the blasphemed name of a God of Love, and our bright sky is never clouded by the smoke of an Auto-da-Fe.

This is much, and great reason have we to be thankful for so many and great blessings. But, as has been said, the evil is mitigated, not destroyed. The spirit of intolerance is as rife as ever, although displayed in other forms. The great multiplicity of sects and parties, nearly equally balanced as to numbers and influence, have caused less bitterness to exist on minor topics, so that the difference of a hair's breadth is no longer considered sufficient reason for mortal enmity. Let but a man, however, depart widely from the tenets of the mass, let him broach doctrines foreign to those generally received, and which have been branded as impious or wicked, and he will not fail to receive condign punishment. Above all, let him embrace despised and rejected truths in the love of them, and proclaim them

in tones that will startle ancient Error on her throne, and make her worshippers tremble for her empire, and his fate will be a sad one. He will be condemned untried. A thousand voices will be raised against him in unreasoning clamor, every epithet of reproach will be applied to him, the doors of society will be shut against him, his very touch will be avoided as a contamination, and he will be driven out like a leper into the wilderness. He will be an abomination in the eyes and a stink in the nostrils of all *professors;* (oh, what a depth of Pharisaism is there in that word!) — former friends will desert him, and happy indeed will he be, if "a cold fireside and alienated home" do not make him feel, that the avowed unbeliever in popular dogmas must in a great measure forego human sympathies. Numberless cases might be instanced to prove the truth of this assertion. Indeed, we cannot cast our eyes around without beholding them. Lamentable evidence of it is seen too in the number of persons, who entertain in secret tenets they do not avow, — who conceal doctrines they cannot but hold, as though they were a crime against society, — and who rejoice in their hearts at the progres of opinions they repudiate in public; thus leading a hollow life, marked only by the cold hypocrisy or sneering indifference to all higher truth, which are the blighting curses of our time. Does this prove nothing? Alas! it is too evident, that our redemption is incomplete. We have attained the outward form of intellectual liberty, but have stopped short of the reality. We have paused in the good work, and leaving the plough in the furrow, have folded our hands in apathy, crying "the labor is over," when there lies an almost unbroken field before us. The spirit of persecution is in unceasing operation, and will be, until, in the progress of society, the friends of freedom have not only asserted but established the absolute and inalienable right of every son of Adam to the unrestrained exercise of mind, and the enjoyment of that faith which seems best in his eyes.

No man of our century has experienced the effects

of this spirit to such an extent as Percy Bysshe Shelley, for no man, departing so far from the popular standards, has spoken out the faith that was in him, with equal ability or such vehement energy. His persecutions, (for such we must consider them,) commenced even in boyhood. He was expelled from his college as a heretic. He was avoided by his early friends and relatives. He was held up as an object for public scorn and hatred. He was first treated with coldness, and finally cast off by the very author of his being, and driven from his home, to spend the remainder of his few and melancholy days, in that "Paradise of exiles, Italy." His children were taken from him by a tyrannical act of Lord Eldon, and Tory journalists applauded and defended the decision of the modern Jeffries, which tore his infants from the bosom of their only surviving parent. Up to this hour, his works are by many forbidden to be read, denounced as blasphemous, and proscribed as though the pestilence were bound up in their leaves. From the publication of his first poem he was considered a prey, upon whom reviewers might expend the utmost rancor of their malignity; and every petty scribbler, who could heap together a few terms of bitter execration, laid an offering on the altar of Cant, and sought to propitiate public favor by abusing Shelley. Not only his writings, but his private character was attacked. His enemies did not scruple to attribute to him almost every vice that can debase Humanity. For thirty long years has he been a target for all the arrows of detraction, and rarely, until of late, has a voice been lifted in his defence. Hence, what was often asserted and seldom denied, has come to pass for truth, and his poems have remained comparatively unknown. To read them has been deemed almost a crime, and all their wonderful beauty and sublimity have been insufficient to bring them into merited notice. The student in his closet may have pored with delight over their rich and sparkling stores, but the author was a perilous unbeliever in the established creeds of politics and theology, whence his works must be carefully eschewed by all sound professors and members of good society.

This feeling, however, appears to be on the decline, and many are beginning to suspect that their tumult of affright and horror was, after all, a false alarm; and that he whom they regarded as a monster was but a man, erring, it is true, in many respects, but presenting much to love and admire. His writings too begin to meet a more extensive notice, and a much juster estimate is coming to be put upon them. We see an earnest of this in the publication of the volumes, whose titles stand at the head of the present article, although it is still to be regretted that we have no American edition of this complete and final collection of his poems. His larger poems have been translated into most of the languages of modern Europe, and some of the acutest critics of Germany have placed the Cenci in the highest rank of dramatic compositions. The Reviews, both British and American, also extend him a much more frequent notice, sufficiently laudatory, and more rational than heretofore.

But we are still surrounded by those disturbing influences which have made the difficulty of properly estimating eminent individuals, living near our own time, proverbial. We find it almost impossible to regard such in the clear light of their own genius, but allow our view to be interrupted or distorted by a thousand clouds of passion, prejudice, or fashion, frequently setting up idols whom the next generation hurl from their pedestals with contempt, and rejecting with contumely those whom a more discriminating posterity elevate to their proper and well-won places, in the temple of Fame. A man's pettiest foibles, his action or opinion upon innumerable topics, his party, or family connexions, his station in society, his acquaintance with this or that man, his relation to this or that clique; — these and a hundred other trifling considerations have, directly or indirectly, a powerful influence upon the opinions of his contemporaries. As time passes on, however, and the object recedes from us, we see it in a clearer light; just as, when the eye is placed too near the canvass, we see only rough blots and dashes of the pencil, but as it is

removed from us, these blend together harmoniously; we perceive beauty in conception, accuracy of drawing, and delicacy of coloring, and the repulsive daub becomes a speaking picture. The strife, whether party or personal, in which a man was engaged, dies out, prejudices become obsolete, and the literary mode of the time, like all the fashion of this world, passes away. A new race arises, who look at the man himself, freed from all extraneous considerations, and pronounce their verdict accordingly. Before their bar he stands or falls by his real merits, and on their final decision he quietly sinks into deserved oblivion, or assumes his station, higher or lower, as it may be, among "the few, the immortal names, that were not born to die." Whether the time has arrived when we may thus calmly and impartially judge Shelley, admits of doubt. It is now nineteen years since he was called away "to meet lone Death on the drear ocean's waste," and the literary world has in that time seen several important changes. Much of the glare that surrounded the most popular men of his day has been dissipated, and we already begin to question the correctness of certain general opinions, which, but a few years since, it would have been heresy to doubt. Still, the prejudices which have been entertained against him are so deeply rooted, that it is to be feared we are not yet prepared to do him justice. It may be said, that the remoteness of our position from the scene of his life will produce the same effect as the lapse of time, — that the width of the Atlantic is equivalent to half a century. Bulwer has remarked, in effect, that the approving voice of the distant American public comes to the British writer like the fiat of posterity confirming his immortality. This is a pleasing idea, and we could as Americans roll the sweet morsel under our tongue with much complacency, were we not conscious that it is untrue. We are more independent in name than in reality. To say nothing of financial connexions, in all matters of taste the majority of our population are as much colonists as they were before the revolution. In letters, as in costume,

we are the merest fools of fashion and slaves of foreign influence, afraid to award deserved praise even to native merit, without the imprimatur of English criticism. Hence we adopted the notions of Shelley, expressed by foreign reviewers, without examination or reflection, and united in denouncing him as an agrarian, atheist, and blasphemer, until his name became a sound of horror, and to read his works was considered an evidence of unsoundness in religious and political faith.

Much of the clamor which has been raised against him relates to his private character and course through life. One desirous simply of defending him might evade this subject, by taking refuge behind the recognised and important distinction between the man and the author. Our object, however, is to consider the genius of the man, not alone his literary productions. The acts and writings of one like Shelley equally bear the impress of his real character, and must alike be regarded as his authentic *works*. The enthusiasm which dictates his poems was never an excitement got up for the occasion, bastard in its nature and false in its results, but was always present with him as an actuating principle. Its influence may be perceived in every portion of his history, whence this and his writings are each a commentary on the other.

The charges preferred against him are, for the most part, general and indefinite. We rarely find the offences of which he is declared guilty distinctly specified. They are all so intimately connected with his speculative opinions, and these again with his eventful history, that it becomes necessary to regard them at one view. Descended from a noble family, with wealth enough to purchase every advantage of education, he was brought up in the country, in almost entire seclusion, or enjoying the society only of his sisters. He was extremely affectionate and sensitive, as a child, and at the same time, active, intelligent and studious. He was also ardent and visionary, and appears to have been early and deeply impressed by those natural beauties among which he dwelt and dreamed. Like his own Alastor,

> "By solemn vision and bright silver dream
> His infancy was nurtured. Every sight
> And sound, from the vast Earth and ambient Air,
> Sent to his heart its choicest impulses."

His education, if we mean by the word the instruction of the schools, was received at Eton and Oxford; but that training which gave its complexion to his life, and made him what he was, was the result of the circumstances of the time, of his own unassisted reflections, and his multifarious and ill-assorted reading. He was indebted to his teachers for little beside his intimate knowledge of the classical writers, for whom (especially the Greek Tragedians) he had an unfailing love.

The age in which he was born was a peculiar one. The high hopes for, and glowing confidence in mankind, awakened by the American and increased by the French revolution, had not yet begun to fade. A new principle had been introduced alike into politics and philosophy, — that of the inalienable rights of man. The writings of Godwin and others of the same school were exerting a powerful influence over the mind of the English people, and circumstances appeared to give much coloring to their high prophecies. In the unparalleled events which had just transpired, a new light had beamed upon men, and they were dazzled by its brightness. A blow had just been struck which shivered the time-honored idols of Europe to pieces. *The People* had arisen in their majesty, and throne and altar, crown and tiara, the mitre of the hierarch and the noble's coronet were about to be swept away forever, before the might of long-oppressed, but now awakened Humanity. Republican notions, even the most extreme, spread widely. Such opinions are naturally captivating to young, ardent, and unsophisticated minds, not yet hardened by the world's wear. It may indeed be predicted of them, that they are especially attractive to those having the greatest goodness and loveliness of character. They are exciting to the enthusiastic, elevating to the imaginative, and cheering to the philan-

thropic. These three qualities were united in Shelley, and he adopted the most ultra-democratic doctrines of his day, with his whole heart. He had full confidence in the noble and holy in man, believed ardently in his perfectibility, and regarded the old modes of tyranny and unrighteousness with horror. His feelings at this period are beautifully described in that exquisite dedication to his Revolt of Islam, which we would advise all to read for themselves, and which whosoever has once read, will be sure to read again. In common with older and wiser heads, he believed that the world was on the eve of some immediate mighty change. Society was travailing with some newer, more stupendous birth. The long reign of sin, ignorance, slavery, and sorrow was tottering to its fall; — the eyes of those then living should not be closed till they had seen its destruction. The nations that had sate in darkness were now to see the fulness of that marvellous light, of which they had yet scarce perceived the dawn. The night was far spent and the day was at hand, — that day, when the new heavens and the new earth were to be revealed to us, in bringing man into harmony with himself, with nature, and with the Creator. Now were to be realized all the glowing visions of the poets and prophets of Humanity. Now were we approaching that glorious period to which the sacred and the heathen bards alike aspired with longing hearts, when "omnis feret omnia tellus," and the lion shall lie down with the lamb. Already was to be seen the coming twilight of that morn, when the "happy Earth, reality of Heaven," should present an unclouded Paradise, where man should no longer earn his bread in pain by the sweat of his brow, but the smiling fields should teem with spontaneous fruits, and the whole family of man, restored to pristine innocence, walk before their Maker in peace and love.

These opinions, extravagant as they may seem to many in this cold and unpoetic time, were very prevalent about the close of the last century, and were embraced with enthusiasm by a large portion of the youth

of England. Very many of those, who have since become eminent in the higher walks of poetry, were deeply imbued with them. Coleridge and Southey were particularly attached to them, and all the subsequent indifference of the former, and Toryism of the latter, cannot make us forget that notable Pantisocratic scheme for building a Utopia in our wild back-woods, which was defeated by a growing preference for the attractive charms of the sister milliners of Bristol. Much of the same spirit may be perceived in Burns, and distinctly traced in the writings of Byron, Campbell, Moore, and others. Shelley, in particular, drank in these ideas with an avidity and ardor that made them as his very life-blood. His whole mind was absorbed by schemes of social reform; — schemes too, that must be carried out forthwith, according to his convictions, and could brook no delay. All old things were to be destroyed; — all was to become new. The politics, philosophy, and theology of ages, were to be swept away at one blow. The order of society was wrong from the foundation, and must be remodelled. All distinctions of rank must be abolished, property must be equally divided, the influence of authority upon opinion must be destroyed, the marriage relation must be reformed, and our very diet regulated by the exclusion of animal food. Such notions, impressed with power upon an ardent boy, produced the effects that might naturally be expected. He became opinionative and disputatious, at the same time that he was studious, thoughtful, and excited to intense and continued mental exertion. The activity, if not the vigor, of his mind is proved by the publication of two novels before the completion of his fifteenth year.

In this state of mind he was sent to Oxford, where he soon attracted attention alike by his talents, eccentricity, and heterodoxy. It has been remarked as a singular coincidence, that his college was the same into which Lord Herbert of Cherbury, to whom he has sometimes been compared, signalized his entrance by a general challenge to a logical disputation. Herbert

might have pleaded his extreme youth in extenuation of his folly, as he was but twelve, but Shelley had seen years enough to have taught him the impropriety of his course. He committed the too common mistake of supposing, that whatever satified his own mind completely for the time, must of necessity be absolute truth, to be rejected by others only through ignorance or perverseness; and accordingly he promulgated his tenets in every way without reserve. At this time he wrote his first poem, Queen Mab, a production displaying a depth of thought, fertility of imagination, and command of language, seldom, if ever, seen in one so young, but presenting at the same time, the coldest, most repulsive infidelity of the French Revolutionary school, dressed in a garb of attractive beauty. This was never published by his consent, and in his later years he regretted having written it. A few copies were printed for distribution among his friends, and one of these falling into the hands of a knavish bookseller, the work was by him given to the public. Once published, Shelley was not the man to equivocate or deny his own production. Such bold heresies could not be allowed to pass unnoticed in the great stronghold of English orthodoxy, and soon attracted the attention of the authorities toward him; but he obstinately refused to retract any of his avowed sentiments, and even invited his teachers to a discussion of the subject. The natural consequences of such a course were expulsion from college, and the marked displeasure of his father.

While we cannot but smile at the boldness and self-confidence of the unfledged philosopher, we must also feel deep regret that his treatment was so injudicious and in the end so fatal. His errors were but the vagaries of a visionary and wayward boy, — that fever-fit of extravagance which so many gifted minds have passed through, and come out hardened and refined from the process. He was in a state of tumultuous excitement, and firmly believed himself in possession of high and holy truths which forbade him to hold his peace. Under these circumstances he should have been met

with friendly counsel, kind advice, wise direction in his studies, affectionate remonstrance. It might even have been well to pass him by with contemptuous indifference, and thus, mortifying his pride, to teach him a distrust of his own opinions, and the propriety of a humbler walk and conversation. Very different, however, was the case. He was met on all sides by those angry feelings which are sure to engender the like in those, against whom they are directed. The anathema of the University was hurled against him, he was exiled from Oxford, and worse than all, he returned to the scenes of his childhood only to find himself a stranger in his own home, to meet only cold looks and hear harsh voices, where once the smile of affection beamed upon every countenance, and the words of welcome fell from every lip. This constituted him, at least in his own eyes, a martyr to a good cause, and sufficed to determine the complexion of his whole career. He had placed himself at variance with the society in which he lived, and now the door for his return was closed against him by the very hands which should, and doubtless gladly would have led him back. Henceforward he was to be the open, bitter, and uncompromising enemy of those institutions and prejudices, which (though he never could have become reconciled to them) he might have made some sort of truce with, and combatted less fiercely and perhaps more successfully.

Soon after this, Shelley increased his father's displeasure by his ill-judged and ill-fated marriage with Miss Westbrook, the daughter of a retired coffee-house keeper. The offence, given to the aristocratic feelings of his family by this union, ended in an entire and final disruption. It was made in the heat of a boyish passion, in which reason had no part, and it is asserted, under the management of scheming friends, who, in seeking to promote the interests of a woman whom they doubtless loved, doomed her to a life of misery and an untimely end. Whatever may have been her natural amiableness or excellence of character, she was totally unfit to be the companion of such a man as

Shelley. She had neither the mind to comprehend and sympathize with so strange a being, nor that trustful, devoted affection, which so often leads the weakest women to cling with implicit faith and uncomplaining constancy to those whom all the world casts off. She was a worshipper of "the respectabilities," and could not turn a deaf ear to the voice of the public concerning her husband, nor could she avoid feeling sensibly the peculiar and isolated position in which her connexion with him placed her. Hence mutual confidence was diminished, and finally indifference took the place of a passion, which both but a short time before probably considered eternal. His opinions upon the subject of marriage came into play here, and, conceiving that they should not be united in their fortunes, who are no longer so in heart, he proposed a separation, to which she assented. The next step in his course is less excusable than any other; — that of seeking a union with another. On this occasion, however, he chose a woman of much more congenial nature, one whose very birth gave her a claim upon his regard, for she was the daughter of two of his oracles, among the most extraordinary persons of an extraordinary time, — William Godwin and Mary Wollstonecraft.

Two years after their separation, his first wife committed suicide in her retirement. His enemies have laid very great stress upon this subject, and invested it with a tissue of falsehood. Whatever were the causes leading to so deplorable an event, the blame does not rest with him alone. Both erred, both suffered, and both are to be pitied; for it was the fate of both to

> "Dream visions of ærial joy, and call the shadow Love,
> And wake and find the monster Pain."

The agony of Shelley, on hearing of the occurrence, was intense; — in the words of a friend who was cognizant of the circumstances, "his whole being was torn to pieces," and he never fully recovered from the shock. Those who feel inimical to him have enlarged much upon this matter, reiterated innumerable calumnies

with regard to it, and again and again discussed his motives and feelings concerning it. We envy not the man who can thus take delight in anatomizing a spirit bowing beneath its burden of grief, or writhing with anguish; or gloat with satisfaction over every quivering fibre of a bleeding heart. Neither do we envy the man who can seize upon some mournful incident in another's history, which is more properly considered a dire calamity than a crime, and magnify it, and distort it, and use every exertion to make it contribute to blast his fair fame, and blot his memory. The particulars of this transaction are not known to the public, and it is right that they should not be. It is a melancholy story, and each of us has, or will have, sufficient of our own to consider, without inquiring into the minutiæ of another's misery; enough is known for every proper or useful purpose. Let the mantle of oblivion be thrown over the rest; —

> "And if the seal is set
> Here on one fountain of a mourning mind,
> Break it not thou! Too surely shalt thou find
> Thine own well full, if thou returnest home,
> Of tears and gall."

That Shelley possessed the gentle household affections in an eminent degree, is abundantly proved by his second marriage. In this he was constant, kind, and affectionate, and his bereaved widow still lives to lament the fate of him, who once made her home happy by his mild presence, cherishing feelings which she has eloquently expressed in the beautiful lines, prefixed to her notes on the poems written in 1822, and of which we cannot resist the temptation to quote one stanza.

> "From far across the sea
> I hear a loud lament,
> By echo's voice for thee,
> From ocean's caverns sent.
> O list! O list,
> The spirits of the deep!
> They raise a wail of sorrow,
> *While I forever weep.*"

He was benevolent in the extreme, and the poor

about Great Marlow, and other places where he fixed his temporary residence, long remembered the prompt assistance with which he was ready to meet all their wants. To those whom he regarded much, he was when in prosperity liberal almost to folly; — some examples of which are mentioned in Leigh Hunt's "Lord Byron and his Contemporaries."

On taking a general view of him, certain prominent features may be perceived. High among these are simplicity, sincerity, and single-hearted earnestness of character. Every action of his life was squared to his peculiar notions of justice and propriety, and every line of his poetry breathes a spirit of truth and an energy, which show that it pictures the inmost soul of the writer. He possessed too an unshrinking moral courage, which nothing could daunt when he believed himself in the right line of his duty. Under its influence he lost rank, fortune, and social distinction, struggled with want, and lived in exile rather than compromise with error, or dissemble his real opinions.

But his principal characteristic was Love, in the highest and noblest sense of the term, — that which is the fulfilling of the law. From the very depths of his being there welled up a fountain of affections for the whole universe of God, and he could pour them out over every object in nature, animate or inanimate. The pale flower by the roadside and the foliage of the forest, the rushing river and the babbling brook, the wild whirling of the autumn wind, and the voluptuous breathings of spring, — all had claims upon his sympathies in common with the bright bird that chirped among the blossoms, the gay insect dancing on the breeze, or even the shapeless reptile that crawled across his path. Above all, he loved his race with a deep and fervent affection, which made him recognise in every member, even the most abject and abandoned of the human family, his neighbor and his brother. The man who is actuated by such a spirit, and who, when the hour of his departure draws nigh, can look around upon God's good works and say, — "Father, I have

loved them all!" — cannot be a bad man; and yet Shelley could have said it with entire truth. His philanthropy, moreover, was of an active and consistent character; for he did not, like too many in our day, consider a general zeal for the welfare of the whole race compatible with a reverse feeling toward every member of it, who might come within his sphere of action. He endeavored to act out his principles upon his narrow stage of life; and how well he succeeded is testified by the many who partook of his bounty, and the fondness with which his numerous friends have dwelt upon every lovely feature in his character and every incident in his varied career. It is impossible to read much of him, without coinciding in the emphatic language of his widow, uttered, not in the first agony of grief, but after time had made her but the more sensible of the real extent of her loss; — "To know him was to love him!"

His mournful death seems a fit conclusion to his melancholy and stormy life, and both afford food for solemn reflection. Here again we see a man who longed and sought earnestly for truth and light, and yet wandered in darkness, or stumbled in dim twilight, — who strove to regulate his course by the strictest justice, and yet a great portion of whose life was involved in one strange cloud of error, — who felt the love of his kind burning in his very soul, and yet was rejected and driven out by them as their enemy, — who was cast in nature's finest mould, and imbued with every tender sentiment, and yet lived amidst the tumults of conflicting passions, and died unseen in the wild war of the elements.

> "A Love in desolations masked, — a Power
> Girt round with weakness."

He appeared among us but for a moment, struggling blindly but mightily with misfortune and evil, and was then snatched from our view in the turmoil of a tempest, apt emblem of that in which he lived. It was as though some mountain eagle, venturing too near the earth, and seized by the strong arm of the whirlwind,

were yet striving upward to the clear empyrean, where it may float in calm security above the storm; — but all in vain; — the fierce blasts sweep him down, the keen hail beats upon him, the white blaze of the lightning dazzles him, yet still he struggles on with torn plumage and flagging wing, till at last he sinks; and as the clouds part and the hoarse thunder rolls in the distance, the proud bird lies lifeless on the shore. If such be the fate of the giants of our race, what great reason have men of smaller stature to ponder well their steps, and pursue the path, which duty seems to dictate, with humility, in mingled hope and fear, lest they too wander from the way, and perish!

The writings of Shelley have been, and still are, seldom spoken of and much more seldom read. His want of popularity may be ascribed in part to certain peculiarities of style and subject, but principally to the bold avowal of religious opinions which are generally considered unsound and unsafe. The prevalent notions upon this subject are much exaggerated, and as they have caused the exclusion of his works from many of our houses and libraries, it is impossible to pass them by in silence. He has been branded as an atheist, and this epithet, once applied to a man, clings to him as closely and as fatally as did the poisoned shirt of Nessus to the back of Hercules. Yet the charge is untrue, and a just consideration of his mental structure would alone be sufficient to forbid such a supposition. His mind was essentially affirmative, not able to rest in doubt or negation, but requiring a positive faith on all subjects presented to it. Atheism, on the other hand, is a mere negative system. Its essence is denial. It is an universal *No*, shrouding the soul in darkness, and blotting out the sun and stars from the moral firmament, without substituting the feeblest rush-light for their genial rays. It destroys and never rebuilds. takes away and gives nothing back. Whether it displays itself in the cold sneers of the mocker, or in that dead spiritless logic, which asks syllogistic proof for truths which are written upon every human heart, and endeavors to

measure Infinity and Eternity by mathematical rules; in either case, it is the same demon of blight and desolation, before whose pestilential breath every high hope and holy aspiration perishes. When it takes possession of the mind, it is as if the sand-clouds of Zahara were sweeping over cultivated fields; — before them the land smiles in plenteous fertility, behind lies the parched and dreary desert. It is the entire absence of religious belief and sentiment, and could never, therefore, have been acceptable to one constituted like our poet. Compare him for an instant with the man who, of all others, best deserves the name of Atheist, Voltaire; — the fire-eyed enthusiast, ready to take his life in his hand and rush into the thickest of the fight in search of a higher truth or greater good for his race, with the light *persifleur* ensconced securely behind his bulwark of specious formulas, and sapping the foundations of a nation's belief with his keen irony and bitter sarcasm. The Frenchman could cry incessantly "*ecrasez l'infame;*" but that done, he had nothing to offer in its place. But Shelley was no mere Iconoclast, and respectable as that calling may sometimes be, in clearing the way for reform, it never could have sufficed for him, for he had the spirit of the Reformer himself. He would let the old idols stand, if he could not, by their destruction, open a path to the temple of a purer worship. If he would have torn down the bricks, it was only that he might rebuild with marble. One would have been content to sound his ram's-horn around each Jericho of superstition, and laugh with derision over its crumbling walls, while the other aspired to strike a lyre, "holier than was Amphion's," and before whose magic sound should arise a newer, nobler creation than even the seven-gated city. Is there no contrast here?

We are not led to this conclusion by these considerations alone. It has been remarked that "man is a religious animal," and it is certain that the principle of veneration is a constituent of every human mind, and stands high among the evidences of the existence of a

Deity. This quality Shelley possessed in a preëminent degree. He was compelled to worship as by an irresistible necessity, and his spirit must ever have had an altar at which to bow down in mingled reverence and love. Under these circumstances, it is impossible that he ever could have been satisfied with the void blank of Atheism, for such convictions would have been to him the blackness of darkness. It is not to be denied that he was inclined to this system for a time. When he first became dissatisfied with the dogmas of his teachers, and anxious and distressed, looked about for light, he naturally enough fell upon the writings of their adversaries, the infidels of the French revolutionary school. With these, and especially with the "Systême de la Nature" of d'Holbach, (frequently ascribed to Mirabeau,) he was for the moment enraptured. The novelty and boldness of their views delighted him, and it is not improbable that, like most young men who adopt similar opinions, he felt his vanity flattered by the reflection, that he had the courage to throw off all the shackles of spiritual despotism, and walk forth freely into their broad fields of speculation. It was under these influences that he wrote Queen Mab; and yet even here we can see his better mind struggling through this, his deepest darkness; for while laboring to disprove the existence of a creative Deity, he enters the special proviso that nothing there said, shall be construed to militate against the hypothesis of an all-pervading and sustaining Spirit, coeternal with the universe, and serving as the soul to this great body of Nature. In the course of time, had he been spared, the native vigor of his intellect would have freed it from much of these heaps of acquired rubbish, and he would gradually have seen with clearer and clearer vision.

To analyze his religious sentiments, viewed at any period of his life, would be a difficult, yet an interesting and perhaps useful task, but we have not space for it here. It will be enough to allude to some of their more prominent points, easily proven by a reference to his writings. And first, it is evident that he had a firm belief in the existence of the Deity.

"The awful shadow of an unknown Power
Floats, though unseen, among us."

And Shelley always felt and admitted, in some form or other, his presence and majesty. His ideas of the character of the Deity do not appear to have been always clear or consistent; but we may infer from his expressions that he considered Him an intelligent and immaterial existence, to a just notion of whose nature the high attributes of absolute Power, Truth, and Love are essential, and by whose prevailing influence all things were made and are now sustained and kept in action. This mighty being he always recognised and bowed down to; and no matter by what name he may have designated him, his conceptions appear more rational than those of many who, in virtue of an external adherence to a form of sound doctrine, whose meaning they have never asked, look down upon him as a hopeless "infidel." He had also faith in the immortality of the soul; and although sometimes distressed, to use his own language, by "those anxious and fearful contemplations that, in spite of religion, we are at times forced to confess to ourselves," he yet took constant delight in believing that this life is but the prelude to a better state, and that

"Death itself may be,
Like all the rest, a mockery."

That he denied the divine origin and authority of Christianity is true; yet when we come to examine this denial, much of it will be found to exist more in words than in fact. By some confusion of mind, he blended the religion of the Bible in one mass with all the schisms and heresies, which have ever been grafted upon it, or arrogated its title to themselves, and rejected them all in common. Worse than this, he seems to have regarded Christianity as responsible for all the so-called religious wars, persecutions, bigotry, and tyranny which have ever blasphemed the name by assuming it. The instances where this appears are numerous. Thus he says;

"One came forth of gentle worth,
Smiling on th' ensanguined earth,
His words outlived him, like swift poison
Withering up truth, peace and pity.
Look! where round the wide horizon
Many a million-peopled city
Vomits smoke in the bright air!
Mark that outcry of despair!
'T is his mild and gentle ghost
Wailing for the faith he kindled."

That he had the most imperfect notion of the faith here referred to, or knew it only as it was taught at Oxford, is evident from the pretended abstract of it in the Notes to Queen Mab. Again he says;

"I see
The wise, the mild, the lofty and the just,
Whom they slaves hate for being like to thee.
Some hunted by foul lies from their heart's home."

And again, in the Prometheus Unbound, the Fury in bringing up before the chained Titan a phantom of the crucifixion, thus addresses him;

"Behold an emblem! They who do endure
Deep wrongs for man, and scorn and chains, but heap
Thousandfold torment on themselves and him."

The word Christianity brought to Shelley's mind the idea less of the sublime doctrines and pure teachings of its founder, than of the hierarchies, state religions, and innumerable forms of spiritual wickedness in high places which have called themselves by its name, and with them, he rejected it. Yet he always entertained the highest respect and veneration for the character of Jesus, and, even in the day of his wildest wanderings, placed him "in the foremost list of those true heroes, who have died in the glorious martyrdom of liberty, and have braved torture, contempt, and poverty in the cause of suffering Humanity." He regarded the moral code of the New Testament as perfect, and there were few books, which he opened more frequently than his Bible. The fact, that he was a poet, is sufficient to account for his profound admiration of the book of Job; but it may give some insight into his character to

remark that his favorite and often-read portions of Scripture were the Sermon on the Mount and the Epistle general of James.

An idea of his theological system, (if we may so term it,) may be formed from a consideration of his Prometheus Unbound, with the plot and characters of which we suppose the reader is familiar; for if he is not, he certainly ought to be. The Prometheus here described is not the "audax Japeti genus," the boldest of the sons of crime, who incurred the divine displeasure by his audacity, but the type of man's better nature bound down to earth, and subjected to the powers of evil, yet bearing up against his destiny. He is sustained by an indomitable will and undecaying hope, and waits in patient confidence for the day of deliverance. At his feet sit the daughters of Ocean, emblems of Constancy and Fidelity. Their sister Asia symbolizes Charity or Love, pure, unsensual, but still human Love, as distinguished from that divine Love, which is the ruling spirit of the universe. This might be proved, if necessary, by a reference to her identity with the Venus Anadyomene, for Panthea thus addresses her :

> " The clear hyaline
> Was cloven at thy uprise, and thou didst stand
> Within a veined shell, which floated on
> Over the calm floor of the crystal sea
> Among th' Egean isles, and by the shores
> Which bear thy name."

Driven out into the wildernesses, she yet expects the time when she shall be restored to her empire over the human heart. Jupiter signifies the mighty and multiform evil, both physical and moral, which holds dominion over the world. Demogorgon is Destiny or Necessity, represented as the child of Jupiter, but mightier than he, and in the end his conqueror, because the fate, to which he succumbs and which drags him with it "down the void abysm," is the necessary consequence of his character and crimes. Jupiter being dethroned, Prometheus is unbound by Hercules, the figure for human strength or power. Love immediately resumes

her former seat, and mankind is restored to its original goodness and happiness, or what with our poet is their synonym, Liberty; with this difference, that with the light of knowledge and developed faculties, they are now in a state of active virtue, instead of mere negative *in*-nocence. The spirits of all nature congratulate one another upon this happy occurrence, and to sum up all, the great lesson of destiny is propounded from the mouth of Demogorgon; — that it is our duty to love and hope and strive and suffer, that we may hasten the coming of the long-desired consummation.

The doctrine taught in this sublime Mythus is simply this, and nothing more nor less; — that in and over all things the spirit of eternal Love reigns supreme; — that He works by fixed laws, the most trifling incident in the meanest corner of the meanest planet being a link in His stupendous chain; — that these laws are immutable, moving on undeviatingly through good and evil, crushing minor interests in their course toward ultimate great ones, and constituting, in short, necessity; — that evil exists now, but shall not always exist; for it will surely work out its own cure under the divine law of necessity; — and that, when this is done, mankind shall exist in that state of undisturbed blissfulness, seen hitherto only in the rapt visions of the prophet, or the passionate dreams of the poet. Such are its teachings, and we can each have our own opinions with regard to their truth or sufficiency.

It is unfair, however, to distort them, or to make them bear an interpretation which the author never intended, and which is not derivable by any just rules of criticism. Some of those, who have an utter horror of Shelley, and fear the tendencies of his works, have endeavored to find here a covert attack upon the very first principles of Christianity. This has been done particularly by a writer in the Biblical Repository, published in New York, some notion of whom may be formed from the fact, that he endeavors to prove that Byron and Shelley were both immediate agents in the hands of the Prince of the Powers of the air, for the accomplish-

ment of his own evil purposes! According to him, this poem is the most daring blasphemy ever perpetrated in a Christian land, Jupiter being intended for the Almighty. Prometheus he considers nothing more nor less than Satan, or the personification of the spirit of rebellion against God, thus crowning our poet, Laureate of the potentate whom he supposes him to serve. By what process of reasoning he arrived at these conclusions he does not condescend to inform us, nor can we imagine. There is certainly nothing in the whole work to warrant them. Jupiter could never have been meant for the Deity, because his reign is stated to have commenced at the termination of the golden age of happy ignorance under Saturn, when Prometheus first awakened man to a sense of his nobler faculties, and to end with the triumph of Demogorgon. He can therefore be nothing but a poetical figure, a type used to represent an abstract and complicated idea. Prometheus, too, is evidently the very antipodes of Satan in character, being as unmixedly good as the latter is bad. There are moreover notions expressly inculcated, which are directly the reverse of those which the Reviewer conceives to be the true signification of the poem. In the dialogue between Asia and Demogorgon, the latter says in answer to her inquiries, that the creator of the living world with all the good that it contains, is "God, merciful God." But when asked who made all the multitudinous forms of evil, he intimates that it is Jupiter, and that he too is the subject of a higher power. Even if he means that this evil being is an agent in the hands of the Supreme, it is nothing more than is daily read and admired in Wordsworth, who has said, in infinitely stronger language, that "carnage is God's daughter." In another place, Demogorgon informs Asia that all is subject to fate and change, but eternal Love. These facts are enough to convince any candid mind, that the drama was written without reference to any existing creed, but is merely a magnificent fable, shadowing forth, in a modified form, some of the sublimest doctrines of Grecian philosophy. Its leading idea, too, is

the same which makes the Christian's eye to beam with hope, in the assurance that the last enemy shall yet be overcome, and Death and Hell trampled under the feet of the Lion of the tribe of Judah. When will they, who advocate the truth, learn to adopt truth and open-minded candor as their only weapon?

These observations will suffice to give some idea of his religious tenets, and it is needless to add that they are enforced with an eloquence and ability rarely equalled. The question still remains, are they or the mode of their promulgation of such a character as to be considered dangerous, or to require the prohibition of his works? It may be doubted whether, in this free age and country, we also should establish our Index Expurgatorius, and imitate systems we reject, by endeavoring to guard what we deem truth by the exclusion of all adverse sentiments. Without, however, entering into a discussion of the general propriety or impropriety of free discussion on all topics, we may remark that the man, who considers his faith in Christianity too weak to bear a contact with these writings, pays but a poor compliment to both himself and it. If it be so easily shaken, the sooner it is shaken the better, for he has built his house upon the sand, and it would be well were he driven out of it, with the chance of finding a surer foundation, before the rains descend and the floods come, and it, with its unhappy tenant, is swept away forever. All the objections here stated are powerless against a man properly grounded in his belief, and if they do raise doubts in the minds of the indifferent, they may not be without their use in awakening them from that lukewarmness, which is described as worse than being either hot or cold. Almost any state of mind upon such subjects is better than that dead, practical Atheism, which cares for none of these things. If the waves of the troubled sea do cast up mire and dirt, they can never putrefy like the stagnant pool.

But even admitting the questionable tendency of his theological opinions, this would be counterbalanced by

the purity of his moral teachings. Few modern writers appear to have caught so much of the spirit of the precepts of the great Master. In his poems he has inculcated the divine law of love in its simplicity and power, and his nightly dreams and daily aspirations painted to him that happy future state, when this law shall rule in the hearts of men, and sin with its consequent sorrow shall alike vanish before its might. He has lamented the prevalence of crime and error, and sung the beauty of virtue in strains that shall never die, but long find a fitting response in every human heart. It is not too much to say that no man can rise from a perusal of these productions, without feeling his good resolutions confirmed, his charities expanded, and a deep love for mankind kindled in his breast.

Shelley's political doctrines may be inferred, in part, from what has already been said. From childhood he was haunted by dreams of social perfection, and he confesses that he always had a strong passion for reforming the world. He could not look round upon the present imperfect condition of society but with impatient displeasure, and desired earnestly the coming of a better day. His principles were eminently liberal and republican, and it is therefore lamentable to see Americans following servilely in the train of English authority, and vilifying this man for his advocacy of those great truths, which are asserted in their Declaration of Independence, and which it is the proud mission of their country to carry into practical operation before the eyes of an astonished world. His ideal of a community was one where absolute equality and peace should prevail, where immutable Justice should be the only lawgiver, and Love the executor of its decrees. He believed the whole race equal before God and man, and regarded every son of Adam as essentially noble, endowed with powers which it is his duty to develop, and free in the enjoyment of life, and the pursuit of happiness. This freedom, however, has its limits; for society, although the natural and only possible state of mankind, is one in which each individual

must surrender a portion of his own will for the safety and good of the mass. This mass is the only earthly sovereign, the only authority, under God, which we are bound to obey. Yet he believed that its power should be limited, the greatest possible liberty being allowed to the individual members, and in this point he coincided with tbe proposition laid down by a native writer; — The best government is that which governs least. The functions of government should be confined exclusively to those objects, which cannot be attained by the free action of individuals, the voluntary principle being left to operate in all the rest. The sole end of society being the greatest good of its members, that community will nearest approach what it ought to be, where all are as equal in circumstances as in the eye of the law, and every man enjoys the fullest means of cultivating his higher faculties, while responsible only to his Maker for the result. Hence he was a steadfast advocate of an unshackled conscience, universal education, and the most equal practicable distribution of property.

Such being the case, he was of course a Radical in English politics. He avowed a general adherence to the doctrines and measures of that party, which has received its name from having had the wisdom to desire, and the boldness to demand, a *radical* reform in the constitution of the country. He has also been termed a "destructive," an epithet which very many are fond of applying to all who are dissatisfied with existing institutions, and who believe that they may be amended. Shelley would have destroyed much that now exists, in the hope of substituting something better for it. He would have destroyed the British monarchy with its legions of privileged leeches, who suck the substance from the toil-worn brow and hard hand of honest industry. He would have destroyed the Church as established by law, and removed every barrier between the conscience of his fellow-being and Him who made it. He would have destroyed the Peerage, with its hosts of "lilies, glorious as Solomon, who toil not, neither

do they spin," but fatten upon the blood and sweat of "the noblest peasantry in the world." He would have destroyed that inequality of fortune, which places the hovel of squalid misery in juxtaposition with the palace of wanton luxury. In short, he would have destroyed all that stands between his countrymen and their better destiny, until the free Englishman might plant his firm foot on his native soil, and holding his head up proudly among the kings of the earth, say; — "I too am a man, your brother and your equal!" If this constitutes him a destructive, such he surely was, and well might he glory in the title. To war with established abuses, to contend mightily with the dominion of wrong and injustice, to stand upon the heights and awaken the nations, as with the voice of a trumpet, from their sleep of ignorance and slavery, — such a mission is granted only to the intellectual Anakim, the sons of the giants, yet this it was that our poet desired to fulfil. The task demands a martyr-spirit, for the lot of him who undertakes it will inevitably be revilings, contempt, poverty, and persecution; but let him hold on his course with unfaltering courage, for though neglected and despised of his contemporaries, his tower of strength will abide long after all the flimsy fabrics which have been reared by its side, and eclipsed it with their tinsel, shall have crumbled into dust and left not a wreck behind.

But Shelley was no politician, in the ordinary sense of the term. He was a poet, and it was enough for him to embody cardinal principles in his poetry, to arouse the torpid mass from their lethargy, and to urge them on to the assertion of their rights in the burning words of song. While contemplating grand results, he could not distinctly perceive the means by which they might be reached. He could awaken an enslaved people to a sense of their Egyptian bondage, and point them to the promised land, but he could not lead them, step by step, through the wilderness that intervenes. When considering the particular measures to be adopted for the amelioration of the existing condition of

Society, he went sometimes wofully astray. Thus, his remarks upon dietetics and the institution of marriage, in the Notes to Queen Mab, present a farrago of nonsense which, but for intrinsic evidences of genius, might appear to be the joint production of Frances Wright and Sylvester Graham. With regard to certain measures of political reform, on the contrary, he was unnecessarily timid and hesitating. He even doubted the propriety of introducing the system of universal suffrage into Great Britain, until the further progress of social improvement had rendered the populace better able to exercise a privilege so important. But all this detracts nothing from his general merits. He was true to his principles throughout, and however much he may have doubted their immediate applicability, he died as he had lived, the champion of liberty and the friend of man.

The writings of Shelley have never enjoyed any very great degree of popularity. This is not ascribable solely to the fact, that his heretical opinions caused him to be little read. That he is not always admired when read might be proved, were it not notorious, by the contradictory opinions expressed of him by critics. Many have thrown by his poems, after looking over a page or two, and wondered that any could be found taking delight in what appears to them unmeaning allusions and distorted images. It is not difficult to account for this. Shelley is not easy reading. The impression first made upon one who takes him up is that of obscurity, and he rises from the task, tired by the constant stretch of his attention, or filled only with a sensation of vague delight. On a second reading, however, all is changed; the thought becomes more prominent, the illustrations appear more apt and graceful, and one alights constantly on passages which he is astonished that he could have passed unnoticed. But when read, he has not always been read aright. This is an important consideration. Poetry, in its true sense, is not a thing to be printed on paper or bound in books. Its seat is not in cramped manuscripts or gilded volumes,

but in the deep heart of man. The most glowing numbers, which the poet may use to convey to others a sense of what he feels, will not find a response in every breast. Words that burn will not always kindle thoughts that breathe. The deaf serpent will not regard the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely. The dim eye may be turned toward a scene instinct with beauty, yet there is the same dull blank as everywhere. So, poetry is a sealed book to that reader who feels no sympathy with the writer. The string when touched may make the sweetest music, but can waken a responsive note in none but those that chord with it. Let a man approach any production with a mind bustling with prejudices on all sides, and he will surely be blind to its merits. Let him even be indifferent, but unable to appreciate the views of the author or partake of his feelings, and there is little likelihood that he will do him justice. Where, however, a sympathy exists, the case is far different, and every line comes home to the reader with power. The rude peasant will feel his breast expand and his pulse quicken at the sound of the most artless ballad of his native land, when all the splendor of Byron and the organ-tones of Milton would fall powerless on his ear.

Here then appears to be the main cause of Shelley's want of popularity. His readers, disapproving his opinions, have found it impossible to comprehend, much less sympathize with his feelings, and consequently could consider his poems only in the colder aspect of works of art. The ethereal spirit was absent; they found little to love in the lifeless form, and turned away in weariness or disappointment. Had they coincided with his sentiments, or been able to assume them for the moment, by projecting, as it were, their minds into his situation, they would have experienced very different results. The majority, however, cannot or will not do this, and hence he remains unknown or unappreciated. That he was aware of this fact and felt its injustice, there can be no doubt. He beautifully alludes to it in the lines prefixed to his Epipsychidion.

"My Song, I fear that thou wilt find but few
Who fitly shall concieve thy reasoning,
Of such hard matter thou dost entertain;
Whence, if by misadventure, chance should bring
Thee to base company, (as chance may do,)
Quite unaware of what thou dost contain,
I prithee, comfort thy sweet self again,
My last delight! tell them that they are dull,
And bid them own that thou art beautiful."

Such language is not arrogance in one conscious of his own greatness, but if it were, he had abundant precedent for it. The lines quoted are imitated from a sonnet of Dante; and Ovid, and Horace have prophesied their own immortality in no measured terms.

It is not to be denied, however, that these poems are justly chargeable with a considerable degree of obscurity. This arises, in a measure, from the fact, that they have little claim on the ordinary, every-day feelings of our nature. They do not come home at once to every man's business and bosom. You hear a song of Burns and are held in charmed attention to the end, for it is a stream of melodious affection gushing from the depths of one human heart, and finding its counterpart in every other. You open a volume of Mrs. Hemans, your eye is arrested, and your mind follows that of the poetess, bound to it by the sympathy of a common joy or sorrow. You can read Scott with ease, for his poetry is but a rhymed narrative of thrilling incidents, or a description of external beauties, natural or artificial. Shelley's, however, is the poetry of intellect, rather than of sentiment. It appeals to reason, more than to passion. To be properly understood or felt, it must be read with careful attention. This, in our newspaper age, when most men seem like students in a law-office, to measure their proficiency by the number of pages they have skimmed over in a given time, is an insurmountable obstacle to extended popularity. Few can be found who will sit down with patient diligence, and peruse and ponder over an author till they feel his soul transfused into their own, see his visions, kindle with his aspirations, and glow with his enthusiasm. Yet until this

can be generally done, Shelley cannot be generally known. Whoever does it will be amply repaid for all his trouble; for, when he has caught the spirit of the author, he will be like one who, toiling in rude mountain passes, comes suddenly upon a valley with crystal streamlets, redolent of all sweet flowers and vocal with the song of birds.

The distinguishing feature in Shelley's mental constitution was the imaginative power in its highest and purest degree. This was the dominant faculty of his mind, and all the rest were, more or less, subjected to it. It has been well remarked, that the man of genius always continues to resemble the child in this; — that ideality is the very life of life, the most trifling object or incident taking part in some imaginary train of romantic action or feeling. This was curiously exemplified by our poet's abiding fondness for certain amusements considered appropriate only to childhood. He had always a passion for the water, and when at college, and even after, would linger for hours near a pool or stream, twisting pieces of paper into the likeness of boats, and regarding them with intense delight as they floated over its surface. Ridiculous as this may appear to some, it gives us a clue at once to the character of the poet, and some peculiarities of his poems. A large portion of his most striking and beautiful imagery is derived from the water in its various states of repose or agitation, from the majesty of ocean to the rippling brook, or even the putrid marsh. It is probable that many if not most of these struck his fancy, as he watched his tiny fleet, each of which might seem to his excited imagination

> "A boat of rare device, which had no sail
> But its own curved prow of thin moonstone,
> Wrought like a web, of texture fine and frail;"

or that pink and veined shell, in which bending gracefully, while its delicate colors glowed in reflected light on her joyous face and heaving bosom, Aphrodite was borne over the dancing billows, and first touched the

golden sands of Cyprus. His imagination revelled among the most brilliant conceptions. He could invest every object in nature with beauty and interest, and "cast the shadow of his own greatness" over all that surrounded him. The words prefixed to his Epipsychidion, and there ascribed to the lady to whom the poem is addressed, are emphatically applicable to himself: — "L'anima amante si slancia fuori del Creato, e si crea nel infinito un Mondo tutto per essa, diverso assai da questo oscuro e pauroso l'aratro." Activity and fertility of imagination, combined with delicacy of apprehension and the ability to observe minute resemblances and discrepancies, have caused his writings to abound with varied imagery. This is, for the most part, just and beautiful, but not unfrequently too abundant. Metaphor is sometimes piled upon metaphor and simile upon simile, until the mind is confused, bewildered, lost amidst the shining throng. In a few instances, the thought seems to lie crushed and buried beneath the superabundance of illustration. Whole passages seem more like store-houses of imagery laid by for future use, than portions of a finished poem. It appears as if the thick-coming fancies had crowded upon him with a power he could not resist. Numerous examples of this may be seen in that singular production already referred to, Epipsychidion.

But he is remarkable for the character of his imagery as well as its quantity. Very frequently his meanings are too remote, his allusions not readily followed, and his illustrations are to be satisfactorily comprehended only by those who, in the language of a contemporary poet, "can put on wings of the subtlest conception, and remain in the uttermost parts of idealism." He delights in the personification of abstract ideas, and uses it more boldly than perhaps any other writer in our language, except Young. Certain often-quoted and discussed passages of the latter, as, for instance, that in the first Book of the Night Thoughts,

> "Punctual as lovers to the moment sworn,
> I keep an assignation with my Wo,"

always have been, and perhaps always will be, a bone for critics to gnaw at. The same thing will obtain with regard to numerous expressions of Shelley, especially in Adonais, which colder spirits will deem over-fanciful and extravagant, while those who can follow his excited train of thought will consider them exquisitely apt and true. He had also a disposition to use external objects, not as similes, but impersonations, whence arises one of his chief peculiarities as a descriptive poet. Many of these ideas are seized with difficulty by those who have less vivid conceptions than the author, but when seen as he doubtless saw them, they strike us with their wonderful sublimity, as in the following daring attempt to embody the sensation of elevating awfulness experienced in a stormy night among mountains, when our souls seem to hold communion with the elements, and the giant shapes of the outward world.

> "The Appenine by the light of day
> Is a mighty mountain, dim and gray,
> Which betwixt the sea and sky doth lay;
> But when night comes, a chaos dread
> On the dim starlight then is spread,
> *And the Appenine walks abroad with the storm!*"

If this be, as it has been denominated, night-mare poetry, it would be well if the effusions of others of our bards contained more of this "stuff that dreams are made of." Another passage, showing the same tendency, is the following,

> "The pale stars are gone!
> For the Sun, their swift shepherd
> To their fold them compelling
> In the depths of the dawn,
> Hastes in meteor-eclipsing array, and they flee
> Beyond the blue dwelling,
> As fawns flee the leopard."

This disposition is perceived yet more distinctly in those pieces, where the incidents are of a supernatural character, as the Triumph of Life, and especially the translation of the *Walpurgisnacht* scene from Goethe's Faust, which some have pronounced untranslatable, but to which he has done ample justice, and even rendered more wild and weird than the original.

Analogous to this is another peculiarity, to which he himself alludes in the preface to Prometheus Unbound. "The imagery which I have employed," says he, "will be found in many instances to have been drawn from the operations of the human mind, or from those external actions whereby they are expressed." Poets ordinarily employ material objects to represent or illustrate the phenomena of life and mental action, while Shelley does the reverse. He either makes these phenomena attributes of the material object, or uses them to typify those things which were originally their types. Thus, the autumn leaves have been used, from the time of Virgil, to symbolize the fleeting-by of ghosts. With Shelley, it is the leaves which "like troops of ghosts on the dry winds pass." The same figure is repeated in a modified form in the Ode to the West Wind, for it is not uncommon to meet a favorite simile repeated in several portions of his works.

> "Thou wild west wind! thou breath of autumn's being!
> Thou from whose unseen presence the leaves dead
> Are driven, like ghosts from an enchanter fleeing,
> Yellow and black and pale and hectic red,
> Pestilence-stricken multitudes!"

The half-detached rock, tottering to its fall, and impending over the head of one fastened to the spot, has been often employed to represent the horrors of a guilty conscience and anticipated punishment. Shelley makes the terror and the agony reside in the rock itself, and illustrates them by a comparison of the kind just alluded to.

> "There is a mighty rock,
> Which has from unimaginable years,
> Sustained itself, with terror and with toil,
> Over a gulf, and with the agony
> With which it clings, seems slowly coming down;
> Even as a wretched soul, from hour to hour,
> Clings to the mass of life."

Another example of the same kind is as follows:

> "Our boat is asleep on the Serchio's stream,
> Its sails are folded, *like thought in a dream.*"

But the most striking and powerful passage of the kind is the following sublime description of an avalanche.

> "Hark, the rushing snow!
> The sun-awakened avalanche, whose mass,
> Thrice rifted by the storm, had gathered there,
> Flake after flake, in Heaven-defying minds
> As thought by thought is piled, till some great truth
> Is loosened, and the nations echo round,
> Shaken to their base, as do the mountains now!"

Passages like these are not comprehended with the same facility as those, where the imagery is drawn from objects under the immediate inspection of the senses, and where the connexion with the antitype is plain at first sight. Men are unaccustomed to look to their internal consciousness for illustrations of external existences, and those who are not habituated to reflection do it with pain. Easy reading marks easy writing. That production which requires but little thought in its perusal, cost but little in its composition. Shelley appears to have written with great labor, the rich fulness of conception struggling with the poverty of expression. A number of pieces remain in a fragmentary condition, where the poet appears to have sought in vain to fix the fancies that crowded upon his mind, the key-word to the whole, being sometimes absent. This difficulty might have been overcome in a measure, as experience made him more familiar with the details of his art. For herein lies the true secret of art and use of practice; — that the artist shall acquire such readiness in giving a palpable form to his conceptions, as to keep them vividly before his mind, instead of losing them in attention to the vexatious minutiæ of the process. An uninstructed painter may have present to his mind the idea of a picture, as perfect in its distinctness, softness, and harmonious beauty, as ever grew beneath the pencil of Raphael, yet he cannot transfer it to the canvass, because it fades from his view while his attention is distracted by the labor and embarrassment consequent upon an imperfect knowledge of the art. So it appears to have been with Shelley. In reading

many of the fragments mentioned you have an apprehension of some huge, indistinct, but sublime conception, which the writer has in vain sought to express, and abandoned in despair. So in many of his poems, which are marked by ruggedness and want of polish, the question appears to have been, which should be sacrificed, thought or expression. Neither would he impair the energy and strength of a first reading by strict reviewing and alteration. "I appeal," says he, "to the greatest poet of the present day, whether it is not an error to assert that the finest passages of poetry are produced by labor and study." (Essays, I. 56.) Still, the finest passages evidently will be written by him who, with equal faculties, has the greatest facility in writing, and can clothe a noble sentiment at once in a dress that will require no revision. The strength of Shelley's poetry, however, lies much more in the thoughts it embodies, than in the form of their expression. Even the finest portions are remembered with difficulty, the words lending very little assistance to the memory.

His versification is not always the smoothest. In some parts, as, for instance, the choruses in Prometheus Unbound and Hellas and some of the minor poems, it flows in a stream of continuous melody. To read them is like listening to a strain of soft, sweet music, so unbroken is the harmony of the metre, and so well does it correspond with the sentiments expressed. Too frequently, however, his style is rude, and his verses, although accurately measured according to rule, rather harsh. In framing many of them he appears to have attended only to the division of his lines into the requisite number of feet, without regard to their musical intonation, thereby bringing several consonants together in such a manner as to render the pronunciation rough and difficult, concluding a line in the middle of a sentence in an unusual manner, and in some instances requiring an accent on syllables other than those ordinarily accentuated. He has written in almost every measure of which our language is capable, and

with varied degrees of success. His blank verse is generally marked by a noble Doric simplicity and chasteness of finish. The lofty sounding lines correspond admirably with the full stream of exalted sentiment, intense feeling, and sublime imagery which they convey. In the Spenserian stanza he was less happy, and has not often been able to produce those strains of mingled sweetness and grandeur into which it has been wrought by Byron. In some of his minor poems, as the Triumph of Life, Prince Athanase, and others, he has employed the "terza rima" of the Italians, which Byron has used in his Prophecy of Dante, and which he seems to have considered himself the first to introduce into English poetry. In this measure the thought and imagery are almost necessarily carried on from line to line in accumulative succession, and it is, therefore, well adapted to Shelley's peculiar powers. One idea or illustration succeeds another in close connexion and intertexture, leaving the mind no pause until it arrives at one of the strophic divisions which occasionally occur. His witch of Atlas runs smoothly in the verse of Pulci, which Byron has made immortal in Beppo and Don Juan. The lyrics, scattered throughout his dramas and among his fugitive poems, show how complete a master of his art he was, when leisure or the humor of the moment led him to exert his powers. There can be no doubt that most of his poems would have displayed a higher degree of polish, had he been spared to give them a more careful and thoughtful revision in later years.

That one of Shelley's poems, which is most read, and which has done most to place him in the estimation in which he is generally held, is Queen Mab. It abounds, as before remarked, in the most heretical opinions, and was written to display the great social and political evils, which the author believed to exist, and to prophesy the coming of a better time. It is a highly finished production, the writer throughout alternating the most captivating lyrical sweetness with the loftiest didactics. On contemplating it we cannot

but smile to see the boy-philosopher handling these weighty matters with such ineffable coolness and confidence, especially when he quotes, and in a manner, appropriates to himself, those magnificent lines of Lucretius ;

> "Suave, mari magno turbantibus æquora ventis,
> E terrâ magnum alterius spectare laborem," &c.

The machinery of the poem is well adapted to introduce the reflections which it is his object to impress upon his readers. It is more easily read than his other productions, the meaning being more distinct, the sentiments more directly and explicitly inculcated, and the illustrations simpler and less abundant. In consequence of these very qualities, however, it is deficient in the beauties that fill the others, and, although of sufficient poetic merit to establish the fame of any man upon a sure foundation, it wants the distinguishing marks of Shelley's genius.

His principal work, in point of size and pretension, is the Revolt of Islam, which was originally published under the title of "Laon and Cythna, or the Revolution of the Golden City." It is a narrative poem, in twelve cantos, and is deeply tinged with the author's speculative opinions. The dedication is one of the very finest short pieces extant. The first Canto is one of those visions of more than earthly beauty and grandeur, with which he delights to introduce his poems to the reader. The remainder is a history in the first person of the aspirations of a pure young heart, yearning for light and liberty, — of the awakening of a great people from the darkness and degradation of slavery by the power of a single voice, inspired by truth and love, — of the dethronement of their tyrants, — of the happiness of a free people, — of the banding together of despots for the extinction of freedom, — of the struggle of the patriots and the ultimate triumph of despotism. The incidents are varied and romantic, and the characters of the principal actors, although drawing too little on our more ordinary sympathies,

are generally lovely, and excite a strong interest in their behalf. Beside the occasional impressions intended to be made, the great moral of the whole is apparently this; — that every such revolt, every contest for human rights against arbitrary power, every resistance to creeds and institutions imposed by force, is productive of benefit, and hastens the hour when these rights shall be universally acknowledged and established, even though it results in defeat. This poem is written in the stanza of Spenser, and abounds in elegant and impressive passages. It is comparatively little read, probably because of its length and intricacy, and the general prevalence of those characteristics of his style already adverted to. His tragedy of The Cenci has been by many pronounced his master-piece. Leigh Hunt admires it so much, that he contends warmly that its author should have written nothing but dramas. It is founded upon a story of unspeakable guilt and misery, which eventuated in the destruction of the noble Roman house of that name, near the close of the sixteenth century. It is singular that so gentle a spirit should have chosen such a subject; and the only reason, and indeed, excuse for it, is the intense interest in it, which he found among all classes at Rome. Although nearly two centuries and a half have elapsed since these scenes transpired, the rude peasants will kindle at the name of the principal actress in them, and defend her cause with enthusiasm. Shelley's servant instantly recognised a portrait in his possession as that of *La Cenci*, and we frequently see copies of these, with their gentle, pensive face, and golden hair escaping from beneath white drapery, adorning the windows of our transatlantic picture-shops. The whole tale is one from which the mind recoils with instinctive repugnance, and should never have been made the groundwork of a play. Yet it must be admitted that our author has managed it with inimitable skill, bringing forward all its prominent points with vivid distinctness, and avoiding the most repugnant ones with consummate delicacy. The persons are involved throughout in one cloud of unmiti-

gated horror, and the excited reader feels as though he were bewildered among the frightful figures of a feverish dream. The character of Beatrice, nobly as it is conceived, is scarcely a redeeming feature. Innocent, unsuspecting, good as far as any negatively can be, displaying a mixture of unfaltering courage with maiden tenderness, she yet evinces no strength of moral principle, endeavors to expiate one crime by the commission of another, and dies in firm adherence to a resolute lie. The actors are borne on blindly by the strange, wild current of evil; and error follows error, and crime, crime, until the curtain falls and the reader feels relieved that it is done. It is to be regretted that Shelley should have expended his powers upon a subject so ill-calculated to display them, and so generally repulsive. This tragedy will, nevertheless, always stand prominent as a monument of his genius. That one mingling so little with men in the active walks of life, from youth a solitary dreamer or a philosophic recluse, should ever become so intimately acquainted with the varied play of human passions as he here appears to be, is little short of miraculous, and indicates, if anything does, a true poetic inspiration.

Let us turn from this to a more attractive subject, a drama of a different order, — the Prometheus Unbound, — which appears to us, both in its conception and execution, superior to all Shelley's other productions. Although it is an attempt to replace the lost tragedy of Æschylus, it yet differs from it considerably. According to the Greek Tragedian, the sufferings of the Titan are terminated by his reconciliation with Jupiter. Shelley makes him ultimately triumphant, and thus obviates the necessity of a compromise between the powers of good and evil. Of the moral of the drama we have already spoken. As regards its high poetic merit there can be but one opinion. It is instinct with beauty from beginning to end. The characters are sustained throughout with wonderful power, and the hero, in particular, presents a combination of all lovely and noble qualities, such as the unaided mind of man never

before conceived. The diction is chaste and exquisitely polished, and the imagery is alternately gentle and grand, touching and sublime. The English language has never been wrought into more varied harmony than in the lyrics which occur in the course of the play. The whole scene in Heaven is incomparably sublime. The play of passions on the part of Jupiter, the alternations from the insolence of triumph to the most abject supplication for mercy, and from fierce defiance to the blackest despair, are drawn as the hand of a master alone could draw them.

Similar remarks may be made with regard to his other poems, and his fugitive pieces. Some of the latter are prized more highly by critics than his greater efforts; as, for example, the Ode to the West Wind and Lines written in dejection near Naples. His translations are also of a superior character, especially those from Goethe, which leave us to regret that he did not complete the undertaking, and give us a translation of the great work of the giant-minded German worthy of the original. The present edition contains several poems hitherto suppressed, the principal of which are Swellfoot the Tyrant, Peter Bell the Third, and the Marque of Anarchy. The two first do not please us. Shelley was not made to write humorous poetry, much less travestie. His imagination was too rich and copious, and his spirit too earnest. His fun has always a serious air about it, and the reader is rapt by some burning thought, when he ought to be laughing at a jest. Such writing appears to us no more agreeable than would be the playing of a jig on a cathedral-organ, amid the dim, religious light of the sacred aisles. The Marque of Anarchy is a production of a very different order. Never did the fiery genius of Greece, in its happiest moments, invent a more sublime mythus than that which introduces the poem; and the address to the men of England will rouse any man, who has a man's heart in his bosom, like the sound of a trumpet calling to battle.

Shelley has never been known as a prose writer;

but the two volumes of essays and letters now published show a graceful, easy, and perspicuous style. The Defence of Poetry is an elegant and triumphant vindication of his glorious art, and, at the same time, an example showing how poetry may be written without rhyme, and melody of intonation, as well as thought observed without a regular division into verses. Pope would have written the Defence in heroics, and even then it would have been cold in comparison. But Shelley had, as he informs us, "a horror of didactic poetry," and agreed with the proposition since laid down by Carlyle, that nothing need be sung which can be as well said, that no thought should be rhymed, unless there is an internal necessity for its being rhymed. His metaphysical fragments display a profundity of thought for which he has never received credit; but are too imperfect to give us any clear view of his opinions.

And now, we have endeavored to introduce to the favorable notice of the readers of this Journal, the works of one of the greatest minds of the present century. In life, he was the object of almost universal distrust and contumely, and it is only now, when his heart has ceased to beat with quickened pulsation at the sound of applause, and his bosom to yearn for the approving sympathy of his fellow-men, that his works begin to meet a merited regard. What estimate posterity will ultimately put upon them, it is impossible for us to know. That it will be higher than ours, there can be no doubt. It is the fate of most great men to be unknown or unadmired by their own age and country. Homer wandered, a blind minstrel and beggar, from city to city, and no one was found to record his birthplace for the gratification of the countless thousands whom he has since instructed and entertained. The gallants of Queen Elizabeth's court could crowd the theatre to witness the plays of "that clever varlet, Will Shakspeare," but they never dreamed that the nations, in after ages, would bow down to this humble player, as one of the mightiest spirits ever vouchsafed

to this undeserving earth. The gay cavaliers of Charles the Second's time knew nothing of the author of Paradise Lost, but that there was "one John Milton, a blind man," who was sometime Latin Secretary to the usurping Roundhead, Cromwell, and wrote verses. Yet his clear fame shall live through all time, in enduring brilliancy, while their names have long ago rotted with their mortal bodies. That such will be the fate of Shelley we do not pretend to prophesy. This much, however, we may predict, that he will stand in the foremost rank of English poets, when some of the literary idols to whom we have bowed ourselves down shall be forgotten, or remembered, like the monkey-gods of Egypt, only as objects of wonder and contemptuous pity.

H. S. P.

Art. II. — *A Discourse on the Transient and Permanent in Christianity, preached at the Ordination of Mr. Charles C. Shackford, in the Hawes-Place Church in South Boston.* May 19, 1841. By Theodore Parker. Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury. Boston; printed for the author. 1841. 8vo. pp. 48.

This Discourse is a favorable specimen of an order of sermonizing, which we should like to see more generally cultivated in our churches. Its style is rich and flowing; its imagery appropriate and striking; its tone earnest and reverent; its thought philosophic and profound; and its effect, when delivered, must have been for the most part pleasing, and even thrilling upon the audience. Its chief fault, if fault it have, is, perhaps, in putting forth some propositions new to the community generally, without accompanying them with the developments and proofs necessary to render their reception easy and certain by those, who might be

previously unprepared to adopt them. He, who brings forward views not generally entertained, should support them in the onset with arguments and demonstrations, that in some degree prevent resistance, and silence objectors. Nevertheless this is but a slight fault, and one which after all chiefly concerns the preacher himself. Taken as a whole, the Discourse can hardly fail to secure to the author a high literary rank, and to place him among the ablest and most successful of our preachers.

The Discourse itself may be regarded as a bold, eloquent, and manly appeal for the truth of Christianity, the reality and permanence of religious faith. We feel while reading it, that it is the outpouring of a soul filled and overflowing with a living faith in the Infinite, the Unseen, and the Eternal; — in the permanence, reality, and surpassing glory of the spiritual world. The author has no doubt, no secret misgiving; he speaks with full assurance, and as one who knows that whereof he affirms. It is not a little cheering, in this age of half-faith, and of no-faith, when even learned professors and scientific defenders of religious belief, reduce all our certainty to merely a high degree of probability, to hear from the pulpit a voice speaking in the tone of strong conviction, and recalling to our memories the faith that overcomes the world.

Mr. Parker selects for his text the words of Jesus, recorded by the Evangelist Luke, in the twenty-first chapter and second verse of his Gospel; — "Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but my WORDS shall not pass away." His purpose apparently is to establish the truth of the assertion contained in the latter clause of this passage, to show that the WORD of Jesus, that is, Christian truth, Christianity, is eternal and unalterable TRUTH; and that it always has been, and always will remain, the law of the soul's perfection, of its redemption from sin, and its union with God. Forms of worship may alter, theological doctrines, or the forms with which men clothe their conceptions of Christian truth, may pass away, and be as if they had not been; but

Christianity itself shall remain ever the same, unaffected by time and its mutations, ever fresh and vigorous in its eternal youth. This is the leading thought of the Discourse; and it seems to have been intended as a rebuke to those dreaming spirits, at home and abroad, who are rashly predicting a period when Christianity will be outgrown and superseded.

But in speaking of Christianity, we must distinguish between Christianity as it lies in the Divine mind, and Christianity as it lies in our conceptions, in our doctrines, or systems of theology. The first only is *permanent*, the last is *transient.*

Christianity, as it lies in the Divine mind, and was borne witness to by Jesus and his Apostles, is the law of the soul's growth and perfection. Man by virtue of the fact that he exists as a specific being, has a specific nature, or constitution. This constitution imposes upon him a law, obedience to which is essential to his existence, and the fulfilment of his destiny as a human being. Christianity taken absolutely is this law. God in making man made him to exist, grow, and attain the end of his being by the principles of the Christian religion. These principles then constitute the law after which God made man; the only law by observance of which man can fulfil the great purposes of his being; or, what is the same thing, find acceptance with his Maker. Hence, it is written "there is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved."

Every organic being, animate or inanimate, is organized in accordance with some specific scheme or plan, which scheme or plan, idea or εἶδος in the language of Plato, is its law, the condition of its existence, and of its attaining to the end for which it was made. Just so far as the being departs or is removed from this law, it ceases to be itself, which is the same thing for it as ceasing to be at all. The law of the oak is in the acorn; but the acorn becomes the oak only on condition of fulfilling it. The lion is a lion only on condition of conforming to the law of its species; and man is man,

properly speaking, only on condition of fulfilling the law after which he was created. If he depart from that law under its physical relations, he suffers physical death; if under its spiritual relations, he sins, or dies a moral death. "The wages of sin is death." "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." If he conform to this law in the first view of it, he enjoys physical health and vigor; if in the second view of it, he enjoys spiritual health and vigor, or, in the language of Scripture, "life," "eternal life." Christianity, strictly defined, is then this law of man's nature, after which man was created under both of these relations, and is therefore the law of man's life in God. In its practical sense, it is called the "bread of life," the living bread, which came down from heaven and gives life to the world. Hence, says Jesus, "except ye eat, ye have no life in you." "He that eateth shall not die, but live forever."

Christianity taken in this sense, absolutely, is what Mr. Parker terms the *Permanent* in Christianity. Thus viewed, it cannot pass away, nor change, so long as man continues to be man, or God's will remains unaltered.

But, this law of our being, owing to the limited nature of our faculties, is never but imperfectly comprehended by us. We cannot embrace it in its entireness. Ever will it on all sides escape us. This is true, in regard both to our powers of original discovery, and also in regard to our capacity to receive and comprehend supernatural revelation. Finite beings cannot comprehend infinity, nor imperfect beings perfection. Christianity, by our own unassisted efforts, could never have been discovered. Our *natural* powers are not equal to its discovery. But although assisted, although a revelation of it be made to us, still the revelation actually made must always be measured by our capacity to receive it. Say, Jesus saw and comprehended the whole of this law, all it implies, that is, the whole of Christian truth, and embodied a complete view of it in his words, he could have so embodied it only to the appre-

hension of his own mind; ours could take in no more of it than our capacities were equal to. His words, though containing to a perfect mind all truth, to our imperfect minds would even then contain as much less than the whole, as our minds fell short of the perfection of his. Now, as we are all confessedly limited, imperfect beings, it follows that our conceptions of Christian truth, whether regard be had to it as contained in the words of Jesus, or as written in the original constitution of our nature, must always be incomplete, altogether inadequate.

But owing to the fact, that we are progressive beings, as well as limited, imperfect beings, we are ever outgrowing the systems in which we embody our conceptions of this law. Our conceptions are ever enlarging, and taking in more and more of Christian truth; and hence the systems of theology, which satisfy us at one epoch, fail to satisfy us at another; like the dwelling of the sons of the prophet, they are ever becoming too strait for us to dwell in, and the prophet must give directions for enlarging them. Hence, theology, like all human sciences, is subject to successive modifications, perpetual alterations. Christianity itself remains unchanged, but our scientific expositions of it change ever, and pass away. Systems of theology are all of human construction, merely the forms with which the understanding clothes its conceptions of Christian truth; and are therefore transitory in their nature. These are what Mr. Parker calls the "Transient in Christianity."

Men embody their conceptions of Christian truth in their systems. They must do this. The soul is never satisfied with a vague conception. The artist catches a glimpse of the beautiful, and seeks forthwith to transfer it to his canvass or his marble; so the soul, when it grasps a portion of the True, seeks to bring it home to itself, to determine its place in a general system of Truth. It is only in this way that the soul can render it practically available, stamp its value, and fit it for general circulation in the commerce of life. But the greatest

and best of men embody in their conceptions but a feeble portion of Christian truth; it escapes them, as we have said, on all sides, spreads out to infinity, beyond their clearest and most comprehensive visions; yet we are prone to conclude that the truth which escapes us does not exist; that all views of truth that we cannot compress within our systems are false, and worthy of no confidence; that beyond the narrow horizon of our vision there is nothing save the inane. But truth, reality is boundless. Beyond that horizon, on which we gaze as the verge of the Universe, there is reality no less than within it; and were our vision but strong enough, we should behold the presence and glory of God there as well as here. Through the operations of the mind's own powers, and the providential aid which we receive from God himself, who never ceases to act, if we may so speak, the part of an educator, the human race is ever advancing, purging its vision, enlarging the horizon of its observation, and making to itself new conquests from the Unknown. We have passed beyond the barriers which arrested the progress of our predecessors; and who shall say that those who shall come after us will not overleap the barriers at which we are compelled to stop? Is it anywhere written in the book of providence, nature, or grace, to man in his progressive career, "Thus far shalt thou come, but no farther?" What then shall prevent our systems, formed indeed with infinite pains, from sharing the fate of all their predecessors? Where is the warrant that exempts them from the general doom of all that is human? The ingenious systems of the Subtle Doctors, of Doctors Angelic, and Doctors Seraphic, have passed away, dissolved as "the baseless fabric of a vision;" and what shall preserve our systems and explications from a like fate? Nothing; not one of them shall endure. It is with systems as with men, one generation goeth and another cometh, but the earth abideth forever; so one system goeth and another cometh, but — Christianity remains.

This is the view which, we believe, Mr. Parker takes

of Theology, or the scientific explications adopted by the understanding for the better realization of our conceptions of Christian truth, and which are for him the Transient in Christianity. Thus far he has advanced nothing new, marvellous, or heretical. We all know that systems of theology are transitory, perpetually changing from age to age, from individual, to individual, and even in the same individual, from one epoch in his life to another, and that too when the form of words in which they are embodied remains unaltered. Catholicism retains but a slight resemblance to what it was in the age of Leo the Tenth, and still less to what it was in the time of Gregory the Great; Calvinism is another gospel with our modern orthodox, from what it was with our stern old Puritan Fathers; Edwards advances on Calvin, as Calvin advances on Saint Augustine; and Stuart and Beecher overshadow Hopkins and Dwight; Oberlin rivals Princeton and Andover; Taylorism wrestles, not without prospects of success, with Tylerism; and Transcendentalism, in some of its modifications, is fast swallowing up the Unitarianism of Priestley and Belsham. Every year modifies the popular faith, though it leaves the old terminology standing. Our conceptions of Christian truth are not what they were; and even the doctrines, to which we have solemnly subscribed, mean for us no longer what they did when we subscribed to them. Our own experience, life and its vicissitudes, which have hardened or softened our hearts, enlarged or restricted our views, have modified the meaning we give to the words we early adopted. No word has the same meaning for us in mature age, that it had in early life. Time and eternity, life and death, as well as our familiar household terms, become to us, as we grow older, words of far graver import than they were, when we looked forth on a world all new to us, all untried, and everywhere charming by its freshness and youth.

The leading doctrine of this Discourse, as we have thus far stated it, is unquestionably sound, and worthy

of all acceptation; and thus far we presume it has given general satisfaction. But as much cannot be said of certain applications which Mr. Parker made of it. Proceeding on the principle, that, though Christianity itself is permanent, yet all theological doctrines are necessarily evanescent, he has ventured to specify certain doctrines, now entertained, which must ultimately pass away. Among these may be enumerated three, as the more prominent. 1. The Inspiration of the Scriptures; 2. The Authority of of the Scriptures; 3. The person, character, and authority of Jesus. Under these three heads Mr. Parker was understood by some to deny that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by Divine Inspiration; that they are to be appealed to as an infallible standard of truth; and that Jesus, as to his character and authority as a teacher from God, is in anywise separated from the great family of reformers, ever appearing from age to age for the redemption of the race. Being so understood, it is alleged that he cannot be a believer in Christianity, and is at best nothing more than a Deist.

For ourselves we interpret this Discourse differently, and certainly should not commend it, if we did not. But even admitting this interpretation of it, we must still contend, that it does not *necessarily* follow that its author is a Deist, or that he *cannot* be a Christian in the highest and best sense of the term.

A Deist is one who, while he admits the existence of one God, denies all supernatural revelations from him to man. The essence of deism consists in this denial. We therefore do not call a Jew a Deist, though he denies the inspiration of the New Testament, for he admits that of the Old Testament; nor the Mahometan, though he denies the inspiration of both the Old Testament and the New, for he admits that of the Koran; nor indeed the Quaker, though he rejects the inspiration of the written word, in the received sense of the Church, for he admits a revelation of the Spirit made directly to the human soul. Now, for aught that appears in this Discourse to the contrary, Mr. Parker may adopt

the views of George Fox and William Penn, and therefore be a believer in supernatural communications from God to man. If so, he cannot with any propriety be termed a Deist.

Nor are we prepared to assert that a man cannot deny the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures, and still be a Christian in faith and practice, — deny in fact all Mr. Parker is said to have denied, and still be literally, really a Christian.

We have defined Christianity to be the law of the soul's life and perfection in God, that law which lay in the Divine Mind, when he made man, and after which, as the heavenly pattern, he made him. It comprises the great principles of justice and love, righteousness and peace, which God has made it essentially necessary for us to possess and observe, in order to fulfil the purposes of our being; that is, to be true men. These principles are not mere creations of our fancy, but divine realities, which exist independent of us. They lie off in the spiritual world, and their dominion is identical with what we understand by the reign or kingdom of God. He who believes in these divine realities, — truths of religion, — is in the strictest sense of the word a believer in Christianity. He believes in what Abraham and Moses, David and Isaiah, Peter and James, Paul and John, believed in, and wherefore not a Christian then in his belief? Whoso believes these truths, lives them, that is, obeys them in his practice, is a Christian in both his faith and his life.

These great spiritual realities are not dependent for their existence on the theories or the facts assumed to account for their revelation. They constitute the original law of the soul. Christianity is older than the cradle of Bethlehem, older than prophets and Scriptures, older than Moses and Abraham, old in one word as the Divine Intention to create man. Prophets and Messiahs may have disclosed it, or borne witness to it; but they have not made it. It exists independent of all the messengers who have proclaimed it, or martyrs that have died for it. It is obvious, then, that it is

something different from the facts with regard to the Bible and Jesus, denial of which is supposed to be infidelity. It is independent of all these facts, for it exists the same, whether men know it, believe it, or not. It would have been precisely what it now is, regarded in itself, if we had had no Bible, no Jesus, taken as the Son of Mary; and would continue to exist precisely the same, even should the Bible be lost, and all traces of the Messiah in his Humanity be obliterated; for God is the same yesterday and forever, and man's nature is unchangeable. The relation, then, between God and man is ever the same. Then the same duties are always obligatory, and the same principles are always necessary to be observed by man, in order to attain his growth and perfection; that is, to be a man.

This is not only a rational, but it is a Scriptural conclusion. Paul never regarded the religion he was teaching as a new religion. He argues against the obligation of the Jewish law, that Christianity, which he calls the "Promise," was made to Abraham, and that the Gospel was preached four hundred and thirty years before the promulgation of the law, and was not and could not be annulled by the law. In the figurative language of the New Testament, it is called "the Lamb slain from the foundations of the world;" and Jesus speaking in its name, says, "before Abraham was, I am;" and John giving us its history tells us it was in the beginning with God, and that by it, or after it, was everything made that was made. Now, admitting this, and admitting that belief in Christianity is belief in the great truths it involves, — which is the sense in which we understand belief in Christianity, — there is and can be no difficulty in conceiving it possible for a man to believe in Christianity, although he should not believe in the inspiration and authority of Jesus and the Scriptures, in the commonly received sense.

But although the original and independent nature of Christian truths be conceded, we shall be told that without the inspiration and authority of Jesus and the

Bible we should never come to the knowledge of it. So we may say that without the scaffolding, the builders could never erect the Temple; and yet the scaffolding is no part of the temple, and serves but to conceal its symmetry and beauty, when once erected. The facts supposed to be denied are no part of Christianity itself; they are at best only the economy Providence has seen proper to adopt for making us acquainted with it. If we do but become acquainted with it, it matters little by what means; nor are we sure that we are warranted in saying that it is only through the "written word" that we can come to a knowledge of the truth. How did Abraham come to a knowledge of it, and become able to rejoice and be glad in it? How did Moses, and David, and the Apostles themselves come to the knowledge of it? Not through the pages of the written word, but through "open vision," through the inspiration of God to their own souls. And why not we come to a knowledge of it, in the same way? Is all intercourse between God and the human soul broken off? Or are we less near to God than they were?

But we shall be told again, that we do never rise to direct cognition of the truths of Christianity themselves, the realities lying off in the spiritual world; but merely to certain accounts or representations of them made in the name of God by certain authorized messengers or teachers. The Christian truth which is the direct object of our faith is not the spiritual reality itself, but the agreement of the authorized account with it. This is a definition of Christian truth different from the one we have given. We define belief in Christianity to be belief in the spiritual realities themselves; they who dissent from our view, define it to be a belief that the representations, professedly given of them in the Old and New Testaments, were given on Divine authority, and therefore must be exact. According to this last definition it is undoubtedly true, that to deny the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures would be to deny the Christian faith.

But this last definition of Christian faith is founded on a defective and therefore a false philosophy of the human mind, — on the hypothesis, that we never perceive the object itself, whether of the natural world, or the spiritual, but a certain idea, mental representation, or picture of it. A sounder philosophy explodes this fanciful idealism, and teaches us that it is the object itself that we perceive, not certain images of it in the mind. Hence we contend that revelation is a real revelation; that it actually reveals to us the spirit and objects themselves, and not merely communicates to us certain representations of them, of the exactness of which we have and can have no means of judging.

On our view of the case, we have always the means within our reach, of testing the exactness, or inexactness of the representations; for we have a knowledge not only of what is told us concerning the spiritual world, but we perceive the objects of that world itself, and therefore can know whether they are what they are represented to be, or not. On any other view, religious faith itself can have, so far as we can see, no solid foundation. The reality of the objects of the spiritual world must ever remain problematical, and the exactness of the representations absolutely indeterminable. But we must take the reality of the objects, and the exactness of the representations on the authority of the teacher. This might answer our purpose perhaps, could we but once establish the sufficiency of that authority. If we could prove that the teacher speaks by divine authority, his authority would no doubt be a sufficient warrant of belief in all he should say. But unable to rise to cognition of the heavenly itself, how can we establish the essential fact, that the teacher speaks by divine authority? By the fact, that he works miracles? On the ground we take, miracles would unquestionably be a legitimate proof of the divine commission of the miracle-worker. "Master, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do the works thou doest, except God be with him." But this presupposes in us the capacity to detect the presence of God in the

miracle. The error of those, who contend strenuously for the miracles, is not in alleging that the miracles were performed, nor in alleging that they are a legitimate and a sufficient proof that the miracle-worker speaks by the authority of God, for thus far we hold with them; — but in so alleging *when they have denied to us all capacity to perceive spiritual truth itself.* The miracles are unquestionably a branch, and an important branch, as we are more and more inclined to think, of Christian evidence; and they serve precisely the purpose alleged by their advocates; but only on the condition, that we know enough of God beforehand to be able to recognise him when he appears in the miracle. "If I do not the works of my Father," says Jesus, "believe me not." But if we have no power of perceiving spiritual truth, how can we determine what are or are not works of the Father? Grant us this power, and then the miracles are legitimate, because then we can tell whether they are wrought by the very finger of God or not.

But if this power be conceded us, as it must be, or all pretensions to any rational grounds of religious faith be given up, we can go the full length of our proposition. The power to detect God in the miracle implies the power to know God; not merely that there is a God, but so much of his character and essence, as to be able to recognise his workings wherever we see them. This then implies a direct perception of spirituality, of the realities of the spiritual world. If we can know God himself, surely we can know the great principles which constitute Christianity; for they are but the manifestation of his will. Then it is possible to know Christian truth, the truths of religion, and to believe in them, independently of the "written word."

In coming to this conclusion, we depart less from what has always been the sense of the Church, than some may suppose. We do not find that, among the early Christians, all means of attaining to a knowledge of the truths of religion were supposed to be confined to the written word. "The disciples were called

Christians first at Antioch." No one will question that they were called so with justice; and yet they had not our Christian Scriptures; and therefore could believe neither in their inspiration nor their authority. Some of the early Greek Fathers contended that the λόγος, *Logos*, which inspired Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles, was the same Speech, Discourse, or Reason of God, which inspired the old poets, philosophers, and mathematicians. The Latin Fathers by no means confine themselves to our sacred canon. The fourth Eclogue of Virgil is according to them a Christian prophecy, and they raise the Cumæan Sybil to an equal rank with Deborah and Huldah. Origen even speaks contemptuously of the written word, and will not allow it to be of any authority, till interpreted by a light coming from another source, which he calls philosophy. The whole Catholic Church has always asserted a means of arriving at spiritual truth, beside the Bible, and even denied the sufficiency of the Bible, without an authoritative expounder, to make us wise unto salvation. Fenelon, the Quakers, and Jonathan Edwards, all assert the reality of the Inner Light, that the soul may hold direct communion with the spiritual world. All our evangelical protestant sects hold that, in what they term "religious experience," God speaks directly to the soul, and reveals himself to it. The Church, saving a few Latitudinarians, and Rationalists, have always borne witness to a means of attaining to a perception of Christian truth aside from the written word. We may assert, then, that in the opinion of the Church generally, as in fact, a man may attain to a knowledge of Christian truth, without the written word, and therefore be a Christian, though denying its inspiration and authority.

So much we have thought proper to say in defence of Mr. Parker's Christianity, even on the supposition, that he denies what he is said to deny. We recognise religion under various forms and disguises, but it is always one and the same religion. There is, and there can be, but one religion, taken absolutely, because God

is always one and the same, and the relation between him and us never varies. The human race has but one law of growth and perfection. The good man of one age or country is good on the same principles, by obedience to the same law, as the good man of another. The Jew, the Moslem, the Hindoo, the Chinese, the North American Savage, so far as they fulfil the purposes of their being, do it by conformity to the Christian law, and are Christians in the same sense he is a Christian, who among us fulfils, to the same extent, the purpose of God in making him a man. Heaven is not so narrow a place as we sometimes fancy, nor is it peopled solely with a colony from our own communion. God is not the God of the hills only, but of the valleys also; not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. All nations are before him, and "he is no respecter of persons, but in every nation whoso feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." They shall come from the north and the south, from the east and the west, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, Peter, and Paul, and James, and John, and Fenelon, and Edwards; while many of us, who have considered ourselves its rightful heirs, shall be thrust out. We cannot repeat too often that there is for the whole Earth but one God, one mediator, one faith, one baptism.

But we do not understand Mr. Parker to deny the inspiration of the written word. In his zeal against some exaggerated views of its inspiration, he has spoken of the Bible in terms we do not commend; but we cannot find that he has uttered a word against its supernatural inspiration. He unquestionably controverts what theologions call "Plenary Inspiration," and refuses to admit that every word in the Bible, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation, is dictated by and written under the controlling influence of infallible inspiration. But this is the case in fact with everybody. Theologians may tell us that they

believe in this infallible inspiration, but they deceive themselves, if they think they believe so in the full sense of the words. No small portion of the labor of all commentators, from Origen down to the author of "Academical Lectures," is to prove that there is not a word of truth in numerous passages of the Bible. Common sense revolts at the plain, obvious import of more than one passage. No man can believe that the Lord literally met Moses at an inn and sought to kill him; nor that Moses actually rebuked the Lord, and virtually shamed him, if we may so speak, out of some of his hasty resolutions, as we find related in the Pentateuch. It is by no means easy for us to believe that the Lord repents, is grieved, angry, and rightly termed "a man of war." Most men, say they what they will to the contrary, find some difficulty in admitting that the Spirit of God dictated the denunciatory part of the Psalms, or suggested certain images, figures of speech, and voluptuous allusions in the Song of Songs. No doubt an ingenious commentator may extract edifying truths from these and other similar passages, as bees may honey from noxious plants, or as a roving imagination may find images of beauty in the clouds, or the lovesick maiden see the form of her lover in the glowing embers on the hearth. But did the writer himself have any conception of the meaning we give to his words? One thing is very certain, commentators of all communions take great liberties with the Bible, liberties which cannot be reconciled with belief in its "plenary inspiration;" and so long as they continue to take such liberties they must pardon us for suspecting that their faith does not extend quite so far as they imagine.

Nor is this all. By means of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis theologians contrive, as one may say, to use up pretty much the whole Bible. One denies the inspiration of Moses, but asserts that of the prophets; another denies the inspiration of the prophets, but asserts that of Moses. Others deny the inspiration of both. One trenches most of the miracles of the Old

Testament; and another two or three of the more important recorded in the New. In regard to the New Testament itself, one class of critics exclude, as interpolations, the first two chapters of Matthew, and the first of Luke. Some question the genuineness and authenticity of John's Gospel, others the general epistles of James and Jude, the second epistle of Peter, the epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse; some deny all inspiration to the historical parts of the New Testament, that is, to the Gospels and the Acts, and others deny it to the epistles of Paul. So between them all, the whole goes, both Old and New. And yet all the writers, to whom we allude in these statements, contend for the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, as the only ground of faith in Christianity, as the only safe and sufficient rule of faith and practice!

The truth is, and it is useless to attempt to disguise it, nobody in reality believes in the "plenary inspiration" of the Old and the New Testaments; and nothing but a fear of consequences, — not to be wholly condemned, by-the-by, — hinders it from being generally admitted to be so. Men worship the Bible, as the man of Mount Ephraim did the gods which he had made and set up in his house, because they must worship something; and they feel that if it should be taken away, — and the denial of its infallibility would be to take it away, as they view the matter, — they should have nothing left; that they would be obliged to exclaim, "ye have taken away my gods which I made, and the priest, and ye are gone away; and what have I more?" But we could reply to them, Your own soul is left; the great law of duty written as with the point of a diamond on your own hearts, — and especially the great and ever living God himself, he who speaks unto all men in all ages and climes, and "unto every man in his own tongue wherein he was born." So be not utterly disconsolate. Ye would still have the substance left, though ye had lost the shadow. We could so reply, and with truth.

The true view to be taken of the inspiration of the

Bible, we presume, is that which is given us by the Bible itself. "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and what they spake "is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness." It is not all of equal value; but it is all profitable to him who would approve himself a man of God, thoroughly perfected in all things. This inspiration is the moving or influence of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of good men, and therefore keeps the spirit and affections of the inspired in harmony with the will of God; but it does not always extend to words, arguments, illustrations; nor to matters which belong solely to what we may term the acquired judgment; and therefore by no means preserves the inspired from falling into errors. David was inspired, and yet he committed many sins; Peter was inspired, and yet he erred, and Paul tells us that he blamed him for he merited blame; and Paul himself, though inspired, had a thorn in his side, a cause of mortification for some moral or intellectual delinqency.

But we shall be told that this view of inspiration places the writers on a par with all men of equal piety and worth, and really awards them no inspiration, but the natural inspiration of piety and goodness. Perhaps so. But in our view of the case the inspiration is strictly, literally, and really supernatural. We have contended for the power of the soul to perceive the realities of the spiritual world. This power we do not hold to be a *natural*, though it is a *universal* power. It results not from the natural and spontaneous nor the reflective exercise of our proper faculties, but is the infusion of light from a source foreign to us. The fountain of this light is not in man, is no part of man, but every man is in relation with it. We are inspired by the Word of God, the Divine Speech, Discourse, Reason, the Logos of the apostle, which is the manifestation of God, the mediator between him and our intelligence, and which enlightens every man that cometh into the world. Now it is by the inshining of this Divine Intelligence, that we are able to perceive the realities of the spirit-

ual world, that we are capable of religion, of having a rational basis for our religious faith.

Now this inshining is supernatural. Supernatural means not only what is *supersensual*, but what is *above nature;* that which surpasses all the proper powers of the being in question. Then since this intelligence is not ours, is not of our procuring, is in no way subject to our volitions, is, in relation to us, impersonal, though personal, in relation to God, who is its personality; and since it shines into us by virtue of its own laws, or, which is the same thing, the immediate will of God, we say with the strictest truth that it is supernatural and authoritative. It is true, all men in a certain degree are inspired, and therefore the writers of the Bible belong to the great brotherhood of the race; but as the inspiration is supernatural, it is also true that the Scriptures are really, and truly, supernaturally, divinely inspired.

But admitting that this inspiration is supernatural, divine; it will perhaps be alleged, since it is insufficient to preserve the subjects of it from all error, that it by no means gives to the Bible that authoritative character, which Christians usually ascribe to it, and which is necessary to constitute it an infallible standard of doctrine. This is partly true, and partly false. It does not give so high an inspiration to the Bible as is usually contended for *in words*, but all that is ever admitted in fact.

Inspiration is always authoritative to the full extent to which it intervenes. The authority of the Bible, so far as it is inspired, is ultimate in all matters of doctrine, whether of faith or practice. To a greater extent than this it is never admitted, save in words, to be authoritative. There is and can be no authority sufficient to make a man believe a proposition to be true, which does not commend itself to his own apprehension of truth. No man believes, or can believe, what he does not understand. The proposition that escapes his understanding is, just so far as it escapes his understanding, to him as if it were not. If he understand it, and it appears to him reasonable and just, he may

believe it; but if unreasonable, and unjust, he does not believe it, cannot believe it, — not even if he knows that by believing it he can gain heaven, or by disbelieving it he shall incur the certain doom of hell. The Bible then never is, never can be, sufficient authority for us in relation to any proposition which we do not understand, or which does not commend itself to our own sense of right, to our own reason, judgment, and conscience. Beyond this, whatever we may pretend, whatever we may fancy, we never do believe on the authority of the Bible.

Consequently, while contending, as we often do, in words, for the authority of the Bible, we in point of fact, never bow to that authority, save when and where we see it in the truth, or at least the reasonableness of its assertions, and to our apprehension, fitness and apparent probability of its teachings. Jesus tells us that to be worthy of him, we must *hate* father and mother, sister and brother, and our own life also. Does any man believe this? Does any one really believe that *hatred* of parents, brothers, and sisters, and one's own life, is a Christian duty? We are to love our neighbor as ourselves. Supposing that we *hate* ourselves, what will become of this command? Jesus prohibits his disciples, when sending them forth, from going into any city of the Gentiles; "for," says he, "save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, am I not sent." Who believes, from this plain positive declaration, that the mission of Jesus was therefore confined to the Jews, and that God did not send him to redeem the race?

We shall be told that these passages, and others like them, are susceptible of an easy interpretation, in perfect accordance with the intuitions of reason. No doubt of it. But when you come to interpretations, what do you do with the authority of the Bible? And where is your infallible standard of doctrine? The whole now rests on the justness of our interpretations, and the Bible can have no higher authority and no more infallibility than properly belong to these interpretations. Admit the plenary inspiration of the Bible,

admit, that in itself it is an infallible standard of faith and practice, still it can be to us only what we interpret it to mean. The Bible is to me as if it were not, till I have read it, construed it, and fixed in my own mind the meaning of its words. Who will vouch for the correctness of my interpretation, that the meaning I assign to it is the meaning with which it was written? This meaning is not authoritative, and yet it is all the Bible to me. The Bible can be to me only what it means to me. Its authority then is only the authority of my interpretation of it. Just as authoritative, just as infallible then and no more, as is my mind in interpreting it, is the Bible authoritative and infallible. To get beyond this, I must have, as the Catholics have always alleged, an authoritative, an infallible interpreter.

But have we this infallible interpreter? Say he is the supreme head of the Church, the Pope. We trust we are not wanting in proper respect for his Holiness; but even his interpretations of the Bible can be to us only what we understand them to be; and as our understandings are confessedly fallible, what shall preserve us from misapprehending them? An infallible interpreter of the interpretations and decisions of his Holiness would then be as necessary, as an infallible interpreter of the Bible itself. Nor will it help us to leave his Holiness, and resort to councils, presbyteries, synods, assemblies, conventions of the Church. Grant that the acts of these reverend bodies are infallible; yet they need interpreting; and it is no easy matter to interpret them even to one's own satisfaction. The Augsburg Confession, the Decisions of the Synod of Dort, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Thirty-nine Articles, are not comprehended at a glance, nor to say the least much more easily than the Bible itself. We must have then an infallible guide in our study of them, or we may mistake their true intent and meaning. Shall we, as a last resort, take to our Grammars and Lexicons, and put our trust in erudition and criticism? Alas! men, fallible men, have

made the Grammars and Lexicons, and made them very imperfect too, as many of us know by sad experience. Moreover both are constructed in accordance with the meaning put by the Grammarian and Lexicographer upon the very works we are to interpret by their aid. So we shall hardly arrive at infallibility through Grammar and Lexicography.

The fact is, and there is very little wisdom or piety in seeking to disguise it, the authority of the Bible, as of all other Books, addressed to the reason and conscience of men, is in its truth, not its truth in its authority. This is the ground on which we all really proceed in regard to it. It is authoritative to us, in the interior operations of our souls, — and these are all that really concern us; for these constitute the criterion by which God judges us, — just so far as we have within us the witness that it speaks from God, that is, speaks truly, and no farther. It may be said that this is to deprive it of its character as a standard, — is to transfer the character of a measure of truth from it to our own minds. If it be so, we cannot help it. God has made us as he has, and so made us that we cannot both believe and disbelieve the same proposition at the same time; that is, cannot admit and *really believe* on the authority of the Bible, what we reject and really disbelieve on the authority of our internal light, reason, or intelligence. This may be our misfortune, but if it be, it must be put up with, and borne with as good a grace as possible.

The whole difficulty arises from the folly of man in laying claim to a measure of truth, which must forever exceed his capacity. So long as he is an imperfect being, his judgments must be fallible; and so long as his judgments are fallible, he can never make any but a fallible use of even an infallible measure. So it may after all be as well to abandon our pretensions to infallibility, and own that all our interpretations, that is, to say our judgments of truth, whether of truth as written in nature, in books, or in our own hearts, must

always want in exactness all that we ourselves want in perfection.

Nevertheless, we are not utterly hopeless. God does not abandon us. He is himself our teacher, although we but imperfectly comprehend his lessons. His light, which is true and infallible, shines into the hearts of all men. We may be dazzled by it, may but dimly perceive it, or may perceive it not all; yet there it shines. This is what we call inspiration, and this becomes for us the judge and interpreter of the inspiration of the writers of the Bible. Without this, we could not appreciate, could not establish, could not comprehend, nor even conceive of their inspiration.

Inspiration itself, whether in us or in the Bible writers, is unquestionably infallible and authoritative. This the human race always feels and admits. The inspiration, however, in either case is only partial, and is far from extending to all matters on which judgments are necessary. So far as individuals are inspired, they of course cannot err; but beyond that point the individual is as liable to err, as if uninspired; for beyond that point he is uninspired. We do not therefore, speaking of the entire intellectual life of any one man, claim infallibility for him, or exemption from error. So of the Bible. Up to a certain point, however, we claim it for both. Hence, up to a certain point, we claim for the human race the means of arriving at a well-grounded faith.

This claim we do not rest solely on either the inspiration of the Bible or that of the human soul, taken singly, but upon both combined. By the interior inspiration, we detect that of the written word, and by that of the written word, we in part, determine and limit the interior inspiration. In the correspondence of the two, in their united testimony, which is the testimony of two independent witnesses, we have our highest degree of certainty. From this it will follow, that we cannot take one part or another of the Bible to be inspired or uninspired, as may suit our caprice. The witness within us, is an independent witness, independ-

ent of us, and we are obliged to receive his testimony. Such parts as he deposes to we must receive, whether it suits our taste, our wishes, desires, caprices, or not. Whatsoever portion of the Bible finds a witness to its inspiration, in the inspiration within us, we are to call inspired. The rest we cannot call inspired; but we must not infer its falsity or want of truth, unless actually contradicted by the Spirit. Then we cannot help believing its falsity, even if we would.

The authority of the Bible then is merely in its truth, and its truth must be perceived and determined by the aid of the inspiration which is vouchsafed by the Spirit, as we have already shown, to each one of us. This is all the authority it deserves, it is all that it claims for itself, all that is really, in the facts of the soul, ever ascribed to it; and all, save in words, with the present constitution of the human mind, that can be conceded to it. It is all too that need be contended for, because this affords us as perfect, as infallible a measure of truth, as we with our limited natures are capable of using.

But, we must not confound this interior light with mere feeling, impression, or affection of the sensibility. Were it a mere feeling, a mere affection of the sensibility, it would be of no authority. Nothing is more variable than feeling. It is never for two successive moments the same in any one individual, and is always different in one individual from what it is in another. Reduced to this as a standard of truth, we should be obliged to take all our vague fancies, all our distempered dreams, all the incoherent ravings of fanaticism, enthusiasm, or artificial exaltation of sentiment or passion, as eternal and unalterable truths. Sentiment is no rational ground of faith. It is personal, diverse, manifold, and indefinitely variable; and if taken as evidence of truth, would make truth vary precisely as vary our feelings, as vary the feelings of different individuals; being one thing with one man, another thing with another, one thing this moment, and a totally different thing the next.

By inspiration we must understand *light*, not *sentiment*. Sentiment often, perhaps always, accompanies it; but is never it. Inspiration belongs solely to the intellect. It is the inshining of the Divine Logos, or Intelligence, and is impersonal and independent in relation to us, personal and dependent in relation to God. God is its personality, as we are the personality of our own thoughts. It is then like the Divine will, without variableness or shadow of turning. It may be termed, as we have sometimes termed it, the spontaneous activity of the Reason; *but only when Reason is taken absolutely, as God's Reason, and not as man's.* It is to be known by its character of uniformity, fixedness, and universality, making it the same at all times, in all places, and with all individuals; and especially by the tone of authority with which it always speaks, commanding at once our assent, and making us feel that no man can resist it without blame, and therefore that we have a right to require all men to assent to it.

It will be perceived by this that we avoid the danger to which it is often apprehended that we should be exposed, were we to rely on this inward light. They who object to it confound it with an affection of the sensibility, and regard it as a mere vague, indeterminate, inward impression. In this sense it would be liable to all the objections usually urged against it. But by distinguishing it from feeling, which it is not, by bearing in mind that it is the inshining of a light which is itself without variableness or shadow of turning, we may see that it must be uniform and stable in its judgments, and that, taken as a rule for determining what is from God, whether the question be of ourselves, nature, or the written word, it must lead to results uniform and stable, in proportion to the sincerity and faithfulness with which it is applied. More than this, we presume, it will not be contended that imperfect, limited beings, like us, can under any circumstances aspire to. The true light may shine, but if the organ of vision be not properly used, or if it be imperfect in itself, the objects on which it shines will be but imperfectly seen.

We pass now to the last branch of our subject, namely, the person, character, and authority of Jesus. So far as the authority of Jesus, regarded in his humanity, that is, as a man, is concerned, what we have already said will suffice. The remarks, we have made on the authority of the Bible writers, are as applicable under this point of view, to him as to them. His authority as a teacher is in the truth of his teachings; that is to say, the authority which we always ascribe to truth. Once satisfied that a proposition is true, we are satisfied of its authority. All truth is authoritative, and we never seek, as we never need an authority back of truth, to sustain or enforce its obligation. The authority of Jesus is the truth then of what he taught; and the truth of what he taught is to be ascertained and determined in precisely the same way, that we have pointed out for ascertaining and determining what is, and what is not inspiration in the Bible; to wit, by the inspiration made immediately to our own souls. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not." "Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" This is the rule which he himself lays down, and which we, who admit his authority, are bound to follow.

The person and character of Jesus have been the subject of so much controversy, and are surrounded by so many associations, holy and unholy, that it is no easy matter to disentangle them, and present them in a true light, corresponding to our intimate convictions of truth, and the records of the Evangelists. One is almost at a loss to determine what is, or what has been, as well as what should be, the belief of the Church in regard to Jesus. We think, however, that we are safe, in saying that the Church universally, with some insignificant exceptions, regards Jesus, as a two-fold being, fulfilling the office of Mediator between God and man, and by virtue of this fact, the Redeemer and Saviour of the world. In the sense of the Church, he is —

1. A man, a proper and complete man, as much so as any other human being, and made like unto his

brethren, partaker of flesh and blood like them, and subject to all their infirmities, sin excepted.

2. He is truly and properly God, very God of very God, and therefore the one living and true God. In this sense, all that may be affirmed of God may be affirmed of him.

3. He is the union of the Divine nature and of the Human, of both natures in their completeness and entireness, a mysterious union, which though intimate, yet leaves both natures distinct, without any intermingling or confusion of essence.

4. It is in this union, that is, as God in mysterious union with Humanity, that he is the Mediator between God and man, and the Redeemer and Saviour of mankind. Viewed solely as God, he does not save, nor viewed solely as man; but in his character of the union of the two.

These statements comprise, we believe, the whole faith of the orthodox church on this article of the creed; at least so far as after a diligent study we have been able to collect it. Now, if we examine attentively these four statements, we shall find, that the essential points involved are, — 1. God was really and truly in union with Humanity in the man Jesus, without, in consequence of that union, ceasing to be God; and 2. That it is God, in his mysterious union with Humanity, that is in fact our Redeemer and Saviour.

Now, if we take the name Jesus, as expressive of this union, then to deny the proper Divinity of Jesus will be heresy; and if we take the name Jesus to signify merely a man, and still regard him as the Saviour, it will also be heresy; because it will be ascribing to man what the Church affirms is true only of God in mysterious union with man. From this it follows, what we suppose will not be disputed, that in the belief of the Church Jesus always stands, when contemplated and reverenced as the Saviour of the world, for God in his connexion, or relation with Humanity.

God, in this connexion, is word become flesh, or God incarnate. Jesus is, then, as to his Divinity, the

Logos of the Apostle, and is, therefore, according to the Church, distinguishable, though not separable, from God, as the reason of a man may be conceived of in distinction from the man himself. Viewed in this sense, he may be said to be generated, for the idea of God logically precedes the idea of his Reason or Discourse; but, as the idea of God without Reason, that is to say, the idea of an irrational or unintelligent God, is inadmissible, the idea of the *eternal* generation of the Logos must be asserted. Though an eternal generation, still the Logos may be conceived of as generated. Then we have first, God unbegotten, ungenerated; and second, God begotten, generated, who in mysterious connexion with Humanity is the Mediator. God thus united is not dead, inactive, but efficacious, and his efficacy in this union is God the Holy Ghost, or third person of the Christian Theodicy. But God in his connexion with Humanity is identical with the Absolute God, is in fact the one living and true God, merely considered in a special relation; of course the Efficacy proceeding forth from him in this union, and therefore said in the schools to proceed forth from both the Father and the Son, — God ungenerated, and God generated, — is the power or efficacy of God himself. Hence, the three are strictly and absolutely one.

Thus far the Church. But in all this it is plain to be seen that it is always God in his connexion with Humanity, "God manifest in the flesh," that constitutes the real Saviour; and the identity of God in this sense, whether viewed merely in the simple connexion itself, or in the efficacy resulting therefrom, with the one living and true God, is that which the Church insists upon, and will not suffer to be called in question. We may now then determine at once, what it is we must admit in order to escape the charge of heresy on this article of the Christian faith. It is simply what we have said, — 1. that God is really united with Humanity, 2. and from this union results the Efficacy that redeems and saves us.

Now, we must not suppose, however the Church may

have expressed herself, that it is necessary to ascribe to God, viewed in this mysterious union, a separate personality, from God the unbegotten. Indeed, the Church prohibits us from doing anything of the sort, by commanding us to assert the absolute identity of God in this relation with the one living and true God. To ascribe to God manifest in the flesh a personality distinct from that of God not so manifest, would be to assert two Gods instead of one. Hence, the Church, though adopting for convenience' sake the word *person*, has always felt, and always admitted, that it was not strictly applicable. God thus manifest is unquestionably a person; but his personality is the one personality of God. So the Holy Ghost is unquestionably a person; but not a separate personality, but the one personality of the infinite and everliving God. This must be the real meaning of the Church, for she has never admitted three Gods, but has always asserted that there is one God, and only one God.

We may now proceed a step farther. We have ascertained that God in his connexion with Humanity is still God. He then loses by this connexion nothing of his Divinity. Then, when we assert the proper Divinity of Jesus, we do but assert the proper Divinity of the Divinity itself; for then we take the name Jesus for God, and not for man. God manifest in the flesh is God, strictly, absolutely God. This is what is meant by the proper Divinity of Jesus. Now nobody believes that Jesus, taken as a man, in his Humanity, is this one absolute God. Jesus, in the sense in which he is man, is not God; nobody ever pretends that he is. Suppose then we separate in our minds, and in our speech, Jesus as a man, from Jesus as God, wherein would be the heresy? In his Humanity, he was not God; nor did he by his union with God lose his Humanity, or any portion of his Humanity. This the Church asserts, in asserting his proper Humanity, on which she insists as strenuously as she does on his proper Divinity. Then in his Humanity Jesus was a man, a proper man, and may be thought of and spoken of, as we would

speak of any other man of equal piety, worth, and goodness, providing such other man can be found.

But what! have we started with the Orthodox doctrine of the Church, and run into the Unitarian heresy? Not by any means. The heresy of the Unitarian does not consist in his asserting that Jesus was a man, literally and truly a man; *but in taking Jesus, in his character of a man, to be the Redeemer and Saviour of the world,* — in resting thus upon an arm of flesh, and ascribing to man the glory due to God alone. This is precisely the charge, which the Church has brought against Unitarianism, and on which she always and everywhere insists. In this sense, as a man, Jesus is no more the Saviour of the world than any other great and good man; and this again is precisely what Mr. Parker has asserted in the passages of his Discourse concerning Jesus, to which exceptions have been taken. He spoke of Jesus as a man, and as a man only, and viewing him in his simple Humanity, he denied that he was the Redeemer and Saviour of the world, precisely as all the Christian world, with the exception of the Unitarians, always have done, and continue to do.

But is not Jesus, by virtue of his connexion with the Divinity, really and truly the Redeemer and Saviour of the world? Not at all. God, we have determined, by virtue of *his* connexion with Humanity is the Saviour. This is the essential point in the creed of the Church. It is God become man, that is, God manifest in the flesh, that saves; not man become God, or man in union with God. The whole history of the controversies on this article of faith proves it. To deny this, to assert that it is the Humanity by virtue of *its* relation with Divinity, that mediates, redeems, saves, — is to fall into the precise error of the Unitarians, to rely on an arm of flesh, and to ascribe the glory of our salvation to man. Jesus then, viewed simply in his Humanity, is not our Saviour, is but simply one of the numerous ministers of God's providence in the education of the human race. This is the real sense of the Church, though not very obvious, because she

has seldom regarded Jesus in his Humanity alone. She has understood, by the Jesus of whom she has spoken, not Jesus the man, but Christ the Lord, God incarnate, or in his relation with Humanity. This is the Jesus that mediates, redeems, saves. But Jesus in this sense is God, the one living and true God. This the Church has always declared it heresy, even "damnable heresy," to doubt. Then it is God, not man, that saves, according to the Church. Then it is, as we say, the sense of the Church, that Jesus as man, in his Humanity, is not the Saviour. Mr. Parker, then, in the view he has given us of Jesus, — for it is not of the Saviour, but the man Jesus, that he speaks, — is guilty of no heresy, but is true to the sense of the Church, *as far as he goes.*

As Christians, however, our minds should be fixed on Christ the Lord, and not on Jesus the mere man. By Christ the Lord, we understand the one living and true God in his connexion with Humanity, that is, God manifest in the flesh. This is the living Christ, which was to be with us unto the end of the world, our advocate with the Father, the wisdom of God, and the power of God unto salvation. This is the Christ that appeared to Paul, the Christ which was ere ever the world was, the same yesterday and to-day and forever. This too is the Christ the Church celebrates in her hymns, to whom she erects her altars, and on whom she relies with a faith that overcomes the world. But Christ, in this sense, is one with God, is God, in the strictest sense of the word, only not God abstracted from Humanity, placed off in the unapproachable depths of eternal night and silence, but God brought near to us, living and manifesting himself in relation to human nature itself.

The difficulties many have felt on this point arise from supposing, that the mysterious union of the Divine and Human natures was true only in the case of one man, Jesus of Nazareth. But the union we recognise there is but the type of the union, which exists between the two natures everywhere. The Church admits this, for she always calls it a union of the two

natures, of Divinity with Humanity, never, in reality, so far as we can perceive, a union of God with one individual only. His union with one individual would have been the redemption of that individual only; but the redemption for which the Church contends is always a redemption of the race. This is the secret of her doctrine of a Federal Head, in which Jesus stands at the head of redeemed Humanity, as Adam did at the head of fallen Humanity. It is the sense of Paul when he says, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive;" and "as we have borne the image of the earthy, so shall we bear the image of the heavenly." All Scripture, bearing on the point, plainly teaches, and all Christians really believe, that we may become united with God as Jesus in his Humanity was, be sons of God in the sense in which he was a son of God, and joint heirs with him of the heavenly inheritance.

John, in writing the history of the Logos, in its special union with the Son of Mary, begins by asserting, first, its identity with God, and then, that it is the life and light of men, and not only light but the true light which lighteth *every man* that cometh into the world; warning us, therefore, not to infer from the fact, that he is about to treat specially of its union with Humanity in one individual, that it is united with that individual only; for it is the life and light of all men.*

---

* The meaning of this proem often escapes us, in consequence of our not attending to the particular design of the Apostle in writing it. It is not only an appropriate introduction to the Gospel History, which John proposed to write, but a complete, though brief, summary of what we may term the Christian Theodicy; and is stated in the form it is for the double purpose of presenting a true Theodicy and negativing a false.

The translation of the Greek term λόγος in our common version is by no means felicitous. The λόγος is not a person, or ὑπόστασις, separate from the being or personality of God; nor is it the *word* of God, except in a highly figurative and poetical sense, or in a sense nearly related to that in which some of our old writers use the word *discourse;* but is properly the Reason or Intelligence of God; or, if you please, God viewed as Reason or Intelligence, in distinction from God viewed as pure Essence, and God viewed as pure Cause, Force, or Power. In the philosophy of the time in which the Apostle wrote,

This is the great, the crowning truth of the Gospel. It is the great truth insisted on by Paul, when brought

---

God as Reason or Intelligence was below and subsequent to God as pure Essence or Being. This notion the Apostle negatives, for according to him ἐν αρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος. God then, as pure Essence, possessed Reason, or was, as we say, intelligent. His intelligence or reason is as primary as his essence,—καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν. If God, as pure essence, is intelligence, then God as pure essence, and God as intelligence, are absolutely identical, one and the same,—καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.

The Apostle in this first verse asserts, as we understand him, the co-existence, co-eternity, and absolute identity of God viewed as Logos, Reason, or Intelligence, with God viewed as pure Essence.

"The same was in the beginning with God." This is a reiteration, common to the style of this writer; and is as much as to say, Do not therefore in your minds separate the Reason of God from God himself. He is primarily, in his very essence, Reason or Intelligence, and therefore let him be such in your conception of him.

"All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." This refers to nature, or the sensible, material universe, and asserts first, the identity of God as Power, Cause, or Creator, with God as Reason or Intelligence; and, second, that nature herself is made by or after the principles of the Divine Reason. God as force, as creator, especially of the material world, was at the time separated from God as pure Essence, and sometimes even from God as Intelligence. The Apostle in the first verse identifies Reason taken absolutely with God as pure Essence, and now in this third verse, identifies God as Force or Creator of the world with God as pure Essence and absolute Reason. The Creator of the world then is God in the first degree, not in the second degree, as Philo and some others seemed to teach; nor in the third degree, as was subsequently taught by the Alexandrians, if not even then. But, if God be primarily, in his very essence, both Cause and Intelligence, then it follows that he must create the world according to the laws, principles, or suggestions of absolute Intelligence. Then the outward world is constructed according to rational laws, rests on a rational basis, and corresponds to the Divine Intelligence or Reason. The phrase δι' αὐτοῦ, according to this construction, must not be taken in a causative sense, as cause efficient, nor as cause instrumental. According to the uniform tenor of the Bible God is the direct and sole creator of the world. He delegates the work of creation to no subordinate agents, and uses no instruments but his own will. He willed and it was; commanded and it stood fast. When, therefore, we say God created all things *by* the Logos, we must mean that he created all things according to the *ideas* or suggestions of his own infinite and unerring Reason.

"In him was life." The Apostle has considered the Logos in relation to God, or in itself; and in relation to nature, of which he declares it the type, model, and basis; he now proceeds to consider it in relation to Humanity; and here he finds it is LIFE. "In him," that is, in the Logos; but the Logos is God; therefore, in God is our

before the Areopagus at Athens, "In him we live and move and have our being." Our life and our light are

---

life, harmonizing with Paul, who says "in him we live, and move, and have our being."

"And the life was the light of men." We live in God as absoluto Intelligence. Then our life is the life of intelligence, or is a living intelligence. Then it is Light, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς, "the Life was the Light of men."* All men share this Life, all live in this intimate union with God as *absolute* Intelligence. Then this Lifo is not only Light, but must be τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν, "the true Light which lightcth every man that cometh into the world."

We cannot proceed to comment on each separate portion of this remarkable proem. Our view of it will be easily gathered, when we say, the design of the Apostle in his Gospel, is to give us the history of the Logos in its special union with a particular individual. He introduces his history, therefore, by considering the Logos, — 1. In itself or in its relation to God, the Absolute; 2. In its relation to Nature; 3. In its relation to Humanity in general; 4. In its relation to prophets and others who had borne witness to it; and 5. In its relation with Jesus, of whom he was specially to treat. This is a very natural, harmonious, and even *artistic* method of arriving at his subject.

Under the first relation, he asserts the identity of the Logos with the absolute God; that is, considering the views he proposed to negative, he asserted, that God is primarily and essentially Reason or Intelligence. Under the second relation he asserts, that God, as absolute Intelligence, is the author of the outward visible universe, and, therefore, must have created it after a rational type, or the principles of absolute Intelligence. Under the third relation he asserts, that God is our Life; that is, God, as we have found him, primarily and essentially Intelligence; therefore our life itself is intelligence, or light; and, therefore again, God is the true Light enlightening all men, for all live the same life of Intelligence. True, all do not perceive this Light, but that does not prevent it from shining or from being light. Verse 5. Under the fourth relation he teaches us, that the Prophets, all of whom were until John the Baptist, the last prior to Jesus,

* "Many manuscripts, versions, and fathers," says Dr. A. Clarke, "connect this with the preceding verse, thus; 'All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made. What was made had life in it; but this Life was the Light of men.'" The good Doctor's comment on this is worth nothing. Admitting this to be the correct reading, it would bring us nearer to the Platonic conception, but would not militate against the interpretation we have given. The Life of the Universe is everywhere in principle the same, but rises to Intelligence only in man. Hence, regarded in the outward world, Plato calls it ἰδέα, but in the human mind it is εἶδος. This reading is probably due to the Platonizing fathers, and therefore not likely to be the genuine one. A little knowledge of Plato, or of the later Platonists, would have saved the Doctor from many of his extravagant and baseless interpretations.

in God, and it is only by this intimate union of the Divine nature with the Human, that we live, that

---

and therefore standing as the *résumé* of them all, have indeed borne witness to this Light, without giving us full and adequate conceptions of it. But now, as under the fifth relation he teaches, the Divine Reason itself has been manifested in the flesh, so clearly, so completely, that we may be said to have seen it in its absoluteness, as it exists in the bosom of the Divine consciousness, full of grace and truth. Verse 14. This full manifestation is the subject of the history itself.

Commentators have erred, as it seems to us, not in ascribing personality to the Logos, but in ascribing to it a separate personality from that of God; which is an error of the same nature with that of considering a man's reason a separate personality from that of the man himself. The design of the Apostle was, unquestionably, to assert the identity of the personality of the Logos with that of God, to deny utterly the notion that it was a distinct *hypostasis*. They have also erred in considering the Logos to be the Reason or Wisdom of God personified. The first is the error of some Trinitarians, the last of some Unitarians. Both errors have resulted from confounding the Logos with Jesus *viewed solely in his Humanity*. The Logos is not Jesus in his Humanity, nor the personality of Jesus as a man; but God in his mysterious union with Humanity. And this error grows out of another, contradicted in the 4th and 9th verses, that of supposing that the union of the Logos with Humanity is only a special union with human nature in the person of one individual, whereas that special union is only a type of its union with human nature in general.

Our readers will do well to consult on this subject, Mr. Andrews Norton's Statement of Reasons. Boston: 1833. pp. 229–250. A work. which, as a whole, we are far from approving, but which throws considerable light on this particular passage of Scripture. We must say, however, that Mr. Norton does not seem to us to have caught the precise character of the Platonic and Neo-Platonic philosophies, which it is necessary to consult, in order to understand the probable design of the Evangelist. We think that he supposes these philosophies to ascribe creation to the Logos in a more absolute sense than they really do. They all virtually harmonize, notwithstanding some discrepancies, more apparent than real, in considering the Logos to be the creator of the world, only in the sense of furnishing its type, model, or plan, as the reason of the architect furnishes him the plan of the building which he proposes to construct, and which he follows in its construction. Their error consisted in sometimes, apparently at least, thinking and speaking of the Logos as if it were a distinct *hypostasis* from that of God taken as pure being. Mr. Norton is unquestionably right in supposing it to have been the design of the Apostle to correct this error, and to identify the Logos with God as pure Essence. But the Apostle was more intent on identifying the Logos with God in its sense of Intelligence, than he was in its sense of creator of the world, a sense in which it is doubtful whether it was ever really understood. The chief point to be asserted was not that God was the direct and sole creator of the world, but that he was Absolute Intelligence, and

we know; whether we speak of life in relation to the body, or life in relation to the soul, which we call blessedness.

The Saviour is God then; but God in intimate union with Humanity. To deny this intimate union, or to deny that God in this intimate union, as manifested in and through Humanity, is God, is what we understand to be the denial of "the Lord that bought us," that denial which is "antichrist," the denial that "Jesus has come in the flesh," and also of the proper Divinity of the Saviour. Now, as the term Jesus, by almost universal usage, is the name appropriated to God, viewed in this intimate union with Humanity, which we may distinguish though not separate from God, viewed as pure essence, and as pure cause or force, we confess we think it not well to speak of Jesus as a "Hebrew youth" or a "Gallilean peasant." These terms are not applicable to the character believed in and reverenced

---

therefore had created all things according to the principles of infinite and unerring Reason. Mr. Norton would then, as it seems to us, have been truer to the thought of the Apostle, if he had translated the Logos, the "Reason, or Intelligence of God," than he has been in translating it the "Power of God." Moreover, his translation mars the beauty and consistency of the proem itself, and disconnects it from the main subject of the history. That subject we have said was the special union of the Logos with an individual of our race. But the Apostle terms the Logos, in this union, Light, and therefore necessarily regards it as a manifestation of the Divine Reason, rather than of the Divine Power. In that manifestation of the Divinity the prominent facts are not creative force, but "grace and truth." Our translation is also as favorable to Mr Norton's views of Christian Theodicy as is his own.

We cannot conclude this note, without adding that if Dr. Adam Clarke, more conspicuous for his reading than for his sagacity or sound judgment, had understood himself, he never would have told us that the term Logos should have been left untranslated. His crude remarks, reduced to some coherence and self-consistency, resolve themselves into precisely the interpretation we have given. He himself tells us that one of the meanings of the word is Reason, and he contends strenuously, that it is "no subordinate being; no *second* to the Most High, but the Supreme Eternal Jehovah." Granted; and what then does it mean, but that the Supreme, Eternal Jehovah, is Absolute Reason, that is, Reason, in itself, or as we say in his Essence intelligent, Intelligence in itself? Commentators would do well to put their separate remarks together, now and then, and ascertain their real import.

by the Church. The faith of the Church we hold to be both philosophical and scriptural. The Saviour it believes in is a real Saviour, is truly Divine, and the only Saviour we have or can have. It matters not indeed much by what name we call him, but it matters as little to change that name. Nay, the name itself, when hallowed by the devotions of ages, consecrated by the prayers and tears, and loves and hopes of millions of our brethren, becomes more than a name; it becomes a NUMEN, and has a power over us, and moves us when no new name can touch us. The name of Jesus is consecrated in our hearts; around it cluster our holiest and tenderest associations, all that is worth living for, or dying for; and we own that we have not the nerve to see it becoming to us as that of Socrates, of Cæsar, or of Cicero. We cannot then approve of the manner in which Mr. Parker has spoken of Jesus. We see clearly enough a sense in which all he says may be, and is true; but it is not the whole truth. The name Jesus does not stand in our hearts, for the Son of Mary, but for God in his intimate connexion with man, for the MANIFESTATION of that LOVE ineffable and exhaustless, which creates, sustains, cherishes, redeems, forgives, saves, and blesses us; and we would not have it dimmed or tarnished by any earthy, or merely human association. It should be to us as to the Jews was the sacred name of Jehovah.

It is time, however, that we bring this article to a conclusion. In it we need not say, we have attempted to discuss freely and somewhat thoroughly, a great and delicate subject. We hope we have discussed it reverently, modestly, not lightly nor presumptuously. We have spoken out our honest thought, as clearly and as distinctly, as was in our power; and we present it to our readers as the solution of several theological difficulties, which have tormented us for years, and which we doubt not have troubled not a few others. We may not have seized the precise thought of the sacred writers; if we have not, our failure is owing neither to our

want of reverence for them, nor to our want of diligence and fidelity in the study of the records they have left us. But, however this may be, we have full confidence that the God of Truth will suffer neither our own nor others' errors to proceed so far as to thwart his benevolent purposes, or seriously to endanger the prosperity and stability of his empire. Truth is competent to sustain itself; and we have no fears that it will fall through, though we should fail to place ourselves underneath it as its support. We can therefore witness the free and bold discussion of all questions, see even youth and indiscretion rushing in where angels fear to look, without losing our equanimity, or fearing that the world must therefore be coming to its end.

Of Mr. Parker's Discourse we have spoken as we have felt. We have not found in it a whole scheme of Christian Theodicy; we have not found in it the distinct recognition of certain views of Christian truth, which we hold to be essential; but we complain not of this; for we do not ask everything from a single discourse. There must always be important truths which the preacher must leave for other discourses, and we have lived too long to infer, that those portions of truth, not crowded into a particular discourse, are necessarily denied or misconceived by the preacher. For ourselves we are grateful to Mr. Parker for his Discourse; he has not told us all truth; but he *has* told us some not unimportant truths. He has spoken out in the tones of a brave man on a great subject, as few men among us have dared to speak. By his earnestness and eloquence, he has drawn the attention of the community to that subject; and by separating it, though somewhat rudely, from the *prestige* which has heretofore overawed us, from the associations which have prevented the mass from seeing it in itself, he has prepared the way for a freer and fuller discussion of it than it has heretofore received.

We need not say, that the free and fearless discussion of all questions of vital concernment to man, both for time and eternity, is no longer a debateable matter.

Whatever may be our individual views and feelings in regard to the wisdom or tendency of such discussion, it is too late to hinder it. Great problems, questions of grave import, have come up, and are laboring in men's minds. While a low and worldly, not to say corrupt, policy predominates in the political and business world, there is in our community a deep under-current of solemn, earnest thought. Men are beginning to think as if life and death hung on the issue. We see it in our friends' faces, we hear it in the tones of their voices, we mark it in almost every movement of the age, in almost every publication sent forth from a teeming press. Great events are in preparation. What the issue will be God only knows; but we rest serene in the assurance, that all things are under the control of a wise and good Providence, who will not suffer even a sparrow to fall to the ground without his notice and permission.

We see all around us starting up the young prophets of Humanity, glowing with unquenchable zeal, and burning with a lofty courage. God speed them. But they will permit one, who has lived long in a few years, whose experience has been varied and bitter enough to teach him wisdom, who has seldom followed the advice he gives, and therefore the better knows its value, to say to them to be careful that they mistake not innovation for progress, and to bear in mind, that a departure from old beaten tracks is not necessarily to be on the road to truth. Let them be brave, be manly, free, and faithful to the intimate convictions of their own souls; but let them also remember that the world has existed many years, and not altogether in vain.

EDITOR.

Art. III. — The Character, Duties, and Qualifications of the Citizen-Soldier. — An Address, July 4, 1841.

The true character of the Citizen-Soldier is noble and exalted. He, properly, combines the highest excellence of both the citizen and the soldier, and by his voluntary association declares himself the champion of his own rights and the vindicator of those principles, as universally applicable, under which he claims his own freedom. His position to-day is the best and proudest commentary on the past, and the highest evidence that in the progress of nations we occupy the position, where the confluent circumstances have united, and bear our portion of mankind onward and upward upon the mighty swell of their advancing tide. In the first history of the human race the citizen did not appear upon the theatre of events, and the soldier was but the blind and involuntary instrument of despotic power. When Cyrus established his wide empire over Asia by the arms of his concentrated tribes, his will was supreme, his word was law, and in all the *minds* which swelled the power of his camp, there was not a single independent will, not one, which dared exercise the freedom of opposing thought. When Xerxes commanded his soldiers to lash the unruly waters of the Hellespont, the millions of followers, who obeyed the behests of the crowned simpleton, passive obedience had made resistless slaves. The Athenian cohort went forth to battle, the Spartan phalanx presented its unbroken front victoriously to opposing multitudes, and the Roman legions were the victors over a hundred nations; yet in neither did the warriors occupy the position of our citizen-soldier; they were state-slaves, fighting for Athens, Sparta, or Rome, and not for the abstract principle which legitimates, or the intuitive sentiment which demands individual freedom in distinction from the sovereignty of the state. The soldier of Europe to-day eats his

bread only as the wages of blood, fighting for kings which oppress, aristocracies which keep him enslaved, and commercial classes which defraud and degrade him; he is but a mechanized instrument, with which others do their deeds of violence, or execute their systems of fraud and crime. The revolution of the British American Colonies, which established the independence of the United States, asserted the freedom of the individual, and elevated the character of both the citizen and the soldier, and united them in a beautiful and harmonious portrait, where the warlike frown upon the brow of the soldier was relaxed by the smile upon the cheek of the citizen.

The Citizen-Soldier is the complete character in the present state of our society. Heretofore the soldier has been the mere instrument of despotic will. The revolution which brought in our form of government was an opposition to governmental tyranny and civil oppression, and the Constitution under which we live was instituted for their prevention. This constitution is the result of all antecedent history, and affirms our rights and proposes the best governmental means for preserving them, which experience had devised, and which concurring circumstances then imposed. It is then the duty of the Citizen-Soldier to form around this Constitution, for its defence and preservation, a linked chain of living hearts. The Constitution must be preserved, at least so far as not to lose any rights obtained, or any advantages which the future may need for the welfare of man. Then what is the duty of the Citizen-Soldier in this connexion? Unquestionably that he shall understand the peculiar form of our government, the principles upon which it is based, and the duties which it enjoins. He must understand the organic construction of the government; where lies its power, when carried to excess, to oppress all or any portion; where it is deficient in strength, and where its various action harmonizes, or discordantly clashes, or comes in grinding collision, with the necessary and balancing energies of the States. He

must pass in examination from its fundamental organization to the subsidiary means which have been attached to it, or claimed, as arising out of this organism, and be enabled to decide upon their constitutional truth; and *then* upon their expediency. And this involves the whole of his political duties. In this investigation he must recall the tyranny which caused the revolution, the evils which were intended to be remedied, and the moral and political truths which that revolution brought into action, and which were incorporated into the constitution, not as defining the rights and sovereignty of the people, but as limiting the powers of the government. Various questions will be suggested, and in the practical detail of life, each must frequently, in relation to these questions, act as an intelligent agent, or blind instrument; and here his action is of vital importance, for the safety of the Republic will be found only in the firmness, virtue, and intelligence of that mighty army whose *ball-cartridges* are deposited in the *ballot-box.*

The duties of the Citizen-Soldier are of a double character. He must investigate the Constitution and understand its governmental action, so that he can support it intelligently, and he will willingly submit to military discipline, that he may know how, and be enabled to defend it on the field of battle. The politicians, the speculators, the protected favorites of special legislation, all who make a *game* of principles, all who earn from their *trade* in the enactments of the state the offices of ambition, or the gold of avarice, may be responsible only for the fraud and infamy, the poverty and misery which may fall upon themselves or others; but the Citizen-Soldier is pledged by the baptism of blood, of himself and others, which he may be called upon to shed, to know that his cause is good, and the principles which require the sacrifice of human life are eternal, and therefore stand forever as his high vindication. It is upon the eternity of truth alone that the vindication of our lives can stand. When the soldier contends for a principle which is

true to-day, to-morrow, and forever, to-day, to-morrow, and forever he stands in the same relation to that truth, as its vindicator and his justificator. Hence the necessity to him and all others, to reach that point of mental elevation, whence the whole plain of human existence can be surveyed, and whence he may see the confluent tribes of men, each with its principle of progress, arising detachedly in the historical movement of each nation, meet in a common stream, like the intersecting or apparently opposing tributaries of a great river, and bring to us one swollen tide of human thought and moral energy. He thus gathers the purposes for which the governments of the world have been instituted; learns that they are not the creations of a fatal necessity, nor the fortuitous productions of a blind destiny; that they had an aim and a purpose, which they have fulfilled, and that they are the connecting links, which bind us through the history of the past with the intelligence from which they were derived, and which is conducting us onward to the fulfilment of a systematic and connected purpose. Each nation, having evolved its term of development, becomes the starting point for the succeeding historical movement, and its trials and sufferings are vindications of truths, through which the future is not required to pass. It is from these broad views he must gather the destiny and duty of the Republic, and learn that there are, throughout the wide system of things, and in the governments of the world, embodied opposing powers; and that in this war of antagonism Right has its opponents and Duty its victims, — but Eternity is the Arbiter of both. And while this antagonism exists, there will be the oppressed and the oppressor, the slave and the tyranny, the subject and the government, the citizen and the state, the tythe-payer and the tax-collector; but presiding above these will be found the harmonious unity of Truth elevating the nations by the perception of its permanence and universality. There is a great moral responsibility resting on the Citizen-Soldier, in the formation of his political opinions and private char-

acter; he is the soldier of Truth or Error as he may determine, and the bond of his enlistment signed in blood never may be cancelled.

It becomes necessary for our soldier in his self-culture to obtain a general view of the history of man. He must observe closely *the life* of each historical nation, and from the lives of all these nations in their successive development, gather the life of the human race and, pursuing this method, discover from the local and historical position of this country, the destiny and duty of American freedom. Each must read this history for himself, and from the facts eliminate the term of our natural development, and his individual duty as subservient to the great moral object, for which our continent was created and all the converging streams of European population and Asiatic and European civilization and cultivation have been thrown upon its broad, diversified, and distinctive plains, but which are united in one grand system of physical union and mutual dependence; over which the twenty-six columns of a republican government now stand in their natural position and simple majesty. The spirit of history must be observed so as to catch the aim and influence of the guiding Intelligence, controlling the visible causes and manifestations, and directing them to the highest and purest result. In this view the earliest history will present man in the plains of Asia, as the patriarch possessing all power even to the arbitrary sacrifice of his children; afterwards the tyrant with his innumerable host of slaves. All power, secular and sacerdotal, concentrated in the hands of one, the central head of the government, and all the masses bowed down to a tame submission by a sense of dependence, which caused them to feel it a duty to be slaves. All power was there concentred in the hands of one. The will of one man was law, usurping property, destroying life, collecting armies, and desolating kingdoms; and man was his instrument, and man was his victim. And there upon the broad plains of Asia, where philosophy will see causes disposing to the submissiveness of the race, where if but a

predominating will appears it seizes the whole sovereign power; Cyrus swayed his sceptre over a boundless empire, and Xerxes sent his millions across the Hellespont for the subjugation of Greece. But Greece, secure in her insular positions, doubly secure in the freedom of her small states, created by a sense of national and individual self-dependence, necessarily arising from the Grecian character and its peculiar limited localities, presented her local positions and insular freedom against the submissive instrumentality of the Asiatic slaves, who could only feel security in their countless multitudes.

This first awakening of moral power showed the triumph of mind, the grandeur and irresistible energy of Freedom. At this point of history the separation of power from the government only commences, and the individual is exalted from the condition of a vassal to that of a component and material part of the state, where the energy of the whole is composed of the aggregate will of the individuals. The state here was supreme; its predominant energy was the combination of individual energies, and by its predominance it called forth, and realized by their very centralization upon the state, all the possibilities of those individual energies. In Asia, all power was concentred in the king, and slaves obeyed his dictates; in ancient Europe all was merged in the state, and the individual was a part of the state, — elevated by the emulation of the insulated Grecian republics, he confirmed beneath Roman passiveness to the sovereignty of the state — the unquestioned supremacy of civism. This had produced its results and left its power and various influences operating upon the minds of men. This then must have been destroyed before a new progress could have been made. All the relations of existence, which could be evolved from the absolutism of the state, had been produced; but the stable tyranny of its iron formulary existed, and sovereignty passed from the state first to the corrupted and mercenary legions of the Prætorian Band, and then to the lawless *freedom* of the Goths,

the Vandals, the Huns, and the Longobards. Later in history the feudality of Europe founded on this lawless freedom of the northern nations, who conquered and divided the Roman empire, was the antagonistic power to the supremacy of the state; dividing, also, its sovereignty, arrogating its privileges, and creating among its powerful or equally balanced Barons *a democracy of Kings*, limiting royal prerogative, asserting the rights of a class which must afterwards pass into general propositions applicable to all. Then King and Baron, and Barons, contending with each other, purchased with granted privileges (restoration of rights) to the masses, the physical power for self-defence. Thus, in time, beneath the royalty and nobility was formed a third advancing interest, and which in Europe now constitutes the separate and exclusive commercial class, herding together by the gregarious interests of their caste.

Man had passed from the absolutism of Asia to the civism of ancient Europe, and in modern Europe advanced under the conflicting antagonism of organized and independent interests. Each class, as it appeared on the great theatre of events, endeavored to maintain its own ascendency,

> "Prest together by the appetite
> And by the power of wrong;"

but in the later history, their mutual relations compelled each to make concessions which became limitations of their own powers. The Past teaches its lesson, and now let the Present remember that the effort of every caste, every exclusive interest, to become a stationary point in the stream of the ages, but increases the weight of the superincumbent resistance, until the accumulated mass, like a French revolution, sweeps terribly onward.

The separation of power from government has been rapidly advancing since the Reformation. To-day in Turkey and Russia, the concentration of power exists, but with causes at work which evidently will scatter and destroy, and England which, in military phrase, has

deployed in the line of progress, presents us a nation which, together with this Republic, shows the gradual separation of power from government, and justifies any extremity of experiment in further limiting governmental action. The throne of England at one time radiated in fact, and yet does in theory, all the governmental action. Judges there are not now openly removed for a want of subserviency to the throne, and a Jeffries does not commit his judicial murders upon the Bench; the king no longer issues his arbitrary decrees through the instrumentality of his commissioners of the Star-Chamber; the legislature in the Lower House of Parliament, emanating more directly from the people, has not for long years presented the contemptible picture of a Rump Parliament tamely registering the rescripts of authority; the fraudulent resort of avaricious monarchs or royal profligates in debasing the currency has not been lately ventured upon; the fires of Smithfield have long since expired, although non-conforming Ireland is still oppressed, and the two-foot rule of the test oath but lately measured the faith of the loyal.

The separation of these powers is working to its last results. The union of the sacerdotal with the political power produced in England a civil war, in which blind enthusiasm, mad fanaticism, and selfish bigotry were connected with and made the instruments of a deliberate and selfish policy. The result of this contest was the settlement and populating of our inhospitable wilderness. Man had not learned to respect individual freedom, and did not perceive its essential and morally necessary independence. The early settlement of, at least, a portion of our continent was a declaration of divorce of church from state, of a separation of the political and sacerdotal powers, while in other portions there was only a declaration of the independence of the church of the immigrants, but which subsequent circumstances rendered a declaration of the independence of all. From the conflict of individual liberty and private interests with the centralized powers of the English government came the American Revolution, and

the Citizen-Soldier for the first time in the history of the world conducted a successful contest for his own rights, determined those rights, and gave them a tangible existence in our present division of governments, and limitations of agency. The constitutions containing these should be examined with the light of history on their pages, and the separation of powers carefully distinguished, and no powers be yielded to the governments, unless they appear clearly to have been granted, and where improvidently granted in the experimental institution of one form of government, be resisted as dangerous in practice and void for want of conformity to the spirit which created the constitution.

The simple element in the frame of the governments, which affirms the liberty of the individual and the independence of the States, is the only safeguard against all encroachment against that union of powers, from which mankind has thus far escaped, and which in its history is the record of power and crime, dependence and misery. As despotism in ancient times and in other lands arose from the concentration of all the powers in one central head, those powers should be separated and restored to their legitimate sources. Truth and political necessity having disparted church and state, the practical propriety is sustained in our experience, and there will be but little desire and no danger of any new combination of these unnatural alliances. So much is settled.

And here is a clear position from which to start in our investigation; for are there not other combinations of powers which heretofore existed in the governments, which may produce despotic action? Our own central government has separated into different departments, and endeavored to make as independent as then practicable of each other the legislative, judicial, and executive powers, with limitations never previously imposed, and rejecting powers exercised by all anterior governments as material and component parts of their political systems. Inquiry here will embrace all questions relating to the finances of the country; and in

this separation of powers the question must present itself, whether the Constitution did not intend to limit the action of government to the least possible scope in this direction. Arbitrary monarchs had debased the currency and deranged commercial transactions, defrauded their subjects, unsettled all the measures of value, and made the relation of debtor and creditor one of hostile injustice by this arbitrary process; they created incorporations which centralized wealth in the hands of the few, and which produced more deplorable consequences than the debasement of the coin in the fluctuations of values and the ruin of the unsuspecting. These evils then had already existed in other governments, and our own soldiers of the Revolution had been deeply injured, and the faith of our early Confederation dishonored by causes similar in their operation, the same in their consequences; and the Constitution made under these circumstances seems on its face to be opposed to the exercise of any correspondent power. Under all other forms of government exclusive classes have existed, and by direct or indirect means have received the aid of legislation, while ours purports to be a government for the benefit of all individually. The foundation, on which this great commonwealth stands, is the equality of all the people taken as individuals, and every interest before the state. The violation of this fundamental law, to however slight an extent, is, to that extent, the introduction of an aristocracy — an inceptive oligarchy; it is the substitution of a privilege for a right; it is the imposition of a burthen upon many, instead of the exaction of a duty from all; and it is the introduction of the will of some over the wishes and interests of all others. The moment there is substituted inequality in taxation, in protection, in privilege, in power before the state, that moment the Republic is changed in its fundamental action, and there is no security for the rights of individuals, and there will be no stay to the aggressions by the *protection* of capital, and the grants of political powers for combined individual purposes. A selfish

debasement of the currency, whether by the coinage of the government or by irredeemable tickets of credit by incorporations derived from the Central Government and the States, mutually dependent and inseparably producing their fatal results together, may effect what the dangerous combination of the monetary with the political power ever has effected in the most arbitrary despotisms of oppressive Europe.

These are important questions with which the Citizen-Soldier must mentally grapple, and which he must comprehend if he would discharge his duty to his country. It is to guard the Constitution that military associations are formed; for with a population of seventeen millions, and the isolation of our continent from any national power able to injure us materially, and with the length of our coast and breadth of our territory, what danger from without is to be apprehended to this Republic? What political power can strike us at all our vulnerable points, or at what point can the successful blow of any enemy be fatal? Our cities may be destroyed and our coasts ravaged, but still we shall be unconquered and unconquerable, each member of our system possessing all the elements of organic life. Our physical position renders us invincible, except through the instrumentality of mind. It is only by the silent and gradual operation of the governmental action undermining and destroying the Constitution, that our liberties can be carried away. Political equality, or the equality of each individual and every interest before the state is the synonym of the liberty of each, and whatever displaces this principle in practice, substitutes to that extent the opposing principle in action, that all individuals and interests are *not* equal before the State. In principle this substitution would be the ancient centralization of power, against which mankind have so long toiled through oppression and blood. Tyranny is the power to prescribe external formulas for the mind, or to control the labor of individuals. The authority in each case rests upon the same principle, but mind and

labor belong to the individual; and to prescribe a mode of action to either, is sacrificing the individual to power — to the supremacy of the state. This would be a return to the olden tyranny. Centralization of all powers in one individual was the absolutism of south-eastern Asia; their concentration in the State was the civism of ancient Europe; in the personal force and lawless violence of the Kings, Barons, and predatory chieftains was the feudality of modern Europe; and this country opposes *individualism, all the rights of all, to the exercise of any powers which do not belong to all, and to each.* Individualism against Centralization, Rights against Authority, Man against Tyranny, are but affirmations of political equality; which again is but the assertion of individual liberty, the right to do all that which one's neighbor has a right to do. Now all men have a natural and, in the absence of positive enactment, a civil right to pass their proper credit upon the community in any shape in which they can induce the community to accept it. Here is the equality of all, the liberty of each; but the legislation of a caste steps in and says, that A. and B. only shall issue bills of credit of a certain kind, and all the other letters of the alphabet shall be forced into the penitentiary to the tune of the rogues-march, for doing what A. and B. are authorized by law to do. Here the moral distinctions are confounded. But the injustice and evil tendency of this inroad upon the primary element of republicanism will be more manifest, if we suppose that Congress, as an already centralized power, should enact that none but citizens of the smallest State in the Union, Rhode-Island or Delaware, should alone exercise this distinctive privilege. Would not our people, even if their power of moral revolution was utterly obliterated by the doctrine of "vested corporate rights," resort to "the arms that God and Nature had given them" to overthrow the outrageous legislation, and restore their political equality? And yet the number of those throughout the entire Union, who would exercise this great prerogative under a charter from the general gov-

ernment, and who now have abused it under their State charters, do not equal in number the inhabitants of this smallest State.

A tariff upon labor for the *protection !* of capital, is a tax upon a hundred thousand for the benefit of one. Circumstances indicate this as the true state of the question. The protective tariff is a tax imposed upon labor for the benefit of capital. Why is this tax demanded ? Because it will enable the workingman here to receive higher wages ? Not at all ; but because labor in Europe is greatly lower than in this country, the European manufacturer can fabricate at less cost than the capitalist here can possibly do, the protective tariff is imposed upon the sale of the foreign fabrics to remunerate the capitalist *the difference* between the wages of European and American labor. The wages of labor here are not enhanced by the system ; it is only a tax imposed upon the consumers here of the fabrics to pay to the capitalist the difference between the wages of labor here and in Europe. It then becomes the interest, and of course the active policy of the American manufacturer, to depress the wages of labor, after his tariff is created ; for the difference between the cost of producing each article and the protected sale-price of such articles *is his profit.* His constant exertion then is inimical to both the laborer and consumer ; — to depress the wages of labor for the one and to increase the taxes upon the other. The former has been the result of the system in every country of the world into which it has been introduced, dragging millions down from independent and honorable labor to dependent misery.

While this effect is produced upon the laborer, the consumer is ever called upon for an increased taxation. The cravings of selfishness are infinite, "its appetite but grows on what it feeds," and the price of the manufactured article, by the constant law of gain, is raised to the highest point which it will produce in the market, by adding the tariff of protection to the cost of manufacturing. Here the foreign fabrics come in, for the American manufactures are selling at the cost of their

production with the highest *protective* tax on the American consumer superadded; the foreign fabrics come in then on the strictest equality, and are sold at the prices of our home productions, the difference of prices occasioned by the protection is paid into the customs, and then the difference in the cost of fabrication between the two countries is carried to Europe, and constitutes the customary and undiminished profit of the foreign manufacturer. Under this state of things the tariff which has been laid becomes nugatory by the natural and interested action of the protected interest, and an additional tax is demanded from the consumer, so that the expansion of prices can ascend higher, and *then* higher, as the history of our own special legislation to certain limited and exclusive interests most fully shows.

The law of universal equalization, keeping up a community of interests, and dependencies between the nations of the world, through which the great energies of mind are brought into action, and their highest benefits universally diffused, cannot be successfully violated without the destruction of other interests; but those interests constantly protected under this law of equalization, produce a healthy reaction in favor of all against the protections of the few; or the law of selfishness becoming omnipotent in the legislation of the country, the interests of capital destroy the dignity and independence of labor, which becomes subsidiary in all its forms, mechanical, agricultural, diurnal, to the controlling power of capital. There are balancing principles which constitute the law of society, and their infringement is followed by consequences, destructive in direct proportion to their violation; for what is given to one is taken from others, and the constant operation of this infringement would take all from the *others* and give to the *one;* but those balancing principles right themselves by one adjustment of the taxation in the dubious palliative of a "compromise tariff;" or the evil increases until the government, as in England, toil on while the desolations of a revolution are preparing beneath them.

These are the results, but the equal distribution of the protective taxes imposed may prevent, by the smallness of the sum individually levied, and the indirectness of its collection, the clear perception of the injustice of the principle, and the secret invasion of the popular rights; yet the combined action of political and commercial causes may precipitate the collection of this inequitable taxation upon certain localities, and the drain of the currency be the first intimation of the unjust and unequal operation of our legislation, produced by the ascendency of a caste. These are barely illustrations of a principle, to show how sacredly the Constitution should be guarded, lest we fall back upon the system of European centralization which has cost so much blood and misery, and where Royalty is but a gilded pageant to preserve, and how here a President, who is not deeply and sacredly pledged to the equal rights of all, may be but a temporary instrument to procure the ascendency of a caste, and to displace the great law of equalization, which is preserving or asserting the rights of individuals and classes, and balancing the intercourse of nations, the law from which no human agency can escape, whose wide-embracing influences grasp the poles of the earth.

It is the accumulation of power around the central government that is always dangerous. A president for life, as a party in the formation of our constitution desired, by the appointment of his creatures to the ministerial, executive, and judicial offices, by the creation of Star-chamber inquests,* by lending himself to particular interests, and organizing peculiar combinations, whether of wealth or vested privileges, by corrupting the legislature, and by the introduction of an English pension system, plundering the people and enriching favored families, could entail the succession of

* Has anybody reflected on the precise nature of the extraordinary tribunals, unknown to our constitution and laws, and repugnant to all our authorized forms of jurisprudence, lately introduced among us for the very laudable purpose of ferreting out official delinquency?
Ed.

his power to his own household. A president, who represents a party having wealth, influence, and will, in the short space of his constitutional term, may give an ascendency to the action of one caste or interest in society, which long years will not reconquer to the whole people; for there is no safety to the people, until the principle shall be established and carried into execution, that they can resume any grant of political powers abstracted from them by selfish or mistaken legislation. Equality before the state of all individuals and interests is the primary law of the Republic; yet a funded debt may be created so as to throw a controlling power into the hands of the fundholders, and give them a lodgment behind the Constitution; twice this result has happened. In its turn, this funded debt may be made, and always will be claimed as the means of taxing labor for the protection of capital; and an executive, wedded to the interests of his caste, may create a judiciary influence which will aid in the centralization of power, in the destruction of the States, and all end in the subservience of individuals to the single, solitary despotism which would "ray out its darkness," from the central power upon all its dependencies.

The Constitution must be guarded, then, that we fall not back; that American freedom becomes not European protection; that equality before the state becomes not chartered privilege nor special legislation. The Constitution is only an advanced point in the progress of man towards his final destiny. It is the political *résumé* of all antecedent experience, and consequently the highest formal governmental vindication of the rights and exposition of the duties of man. This then should not be lost, lest we be compelled to retrace the past, along which lie the scattered ruins of the empires, and even where, amid the mournful fragments of their desolated capitols, blood yet profusely flows and groans of oppression are yet heard. What has been gained must not be lost; we must hold on to the present, against the influences of the past, while at the same time the eye should be turned upon the future with a

glorious prophecy. The world is in a state of constant transition onward. Omniscience has not finished his work and declared its results, for the condition of man has not yet vindicated the supremacy of Truth, Justice, and Love. These are principles which in many of their relations yet lie above the Constitution and the action of society, and the results of which have not been incorporated into any structure of government; but which are forming in society ready to assume the external and visible embodiment in which they will clothe themselves. The invisible becomes visible; theory develops itself into practice, and the progress of nations embodies highest truths in political forms. Then, Citizen-Soldier, while you stand by the Constitution, look firmly and calmly forward; and when a great truth rises up from the abysm, march to its vindication and defence. Old forms must yield to new principles. Truth must advance onward to the justification of eternal Reason, Justice to the vindication of omnipotent Power, and Equality to the perception and assertion of a law of infinite *Love;* and in the future, under the guidance of these abiding and self-vindicating principles, shall come again *the Restoration of the Race.* Above all constitutions stand these principles, reflexes of the Intelligence, the Power and the Impulse which created all, and while you defend the Constitution, you only guard it as an advanced point in the line of progress towards their consummation, as a victorious battle-ground to new conquests for the broad republic of mind over the declining empire of government, over ignorance, selfishness, and passion.

W.

Wheeling, July, 1841.

Art. IV. — *Orphic Sayings.* By A. Bronson Alcott.

I. REFORM.

Regeneration is the parent of reformation. Only Saints are reformers. Be still, thou blustering, bristling Radical, and listen reverently awhile to the whispers of the Divine Reformer within thee. Renew thyself, ere thou settest out on thy crusade against the Ages. Thou overcomest the world by conquering thyself. Self-conquest is the initiative to the marvels of reform.

II. MAGNANIMITY.

Brave deeds cost worlds.

III. EXPERIENCE.

Truth must be lived before it can be seen; loved, before embraced. The Soul but reflects herself through images of sense. She is, and contains whatsoever appears without. Experience alone lifts the veil of sense to rebehold in Ideas the Face of God. Nature is the effigy of man, and man the Idol of God.

IV. CHARITY.

Lovest thou nothing, — then thou knowest nothing. All knowledge is born of charity; all wisdom, of piety. Love, and divine the mysteries of the Godhead, love, and become a God.

V. DOOMSDAY.

Wheresoever the upright sojourns, there doth the great God cast his shadow to hold man in awe. In the presence of Sanctity, all men fear, all men adore, the perfect Deity. Then is the doomsday; and there is the Judgment.

VI. INSPIRATION.

The logic of the Breast is too subtile and instant for the Reason. It is quick with Omniscience. It affirms

always from present, face-to-face, parley with eternal facts. It darts straight to its quarry and rends all formulas of the Schools, as it illuminates the heavens of the mind. It is light, intuition, self-revelation. Dazzled by excess of its brightness, sense is blinded, and reason gropes in the divine darkness. All reasoning is but self-finding, self-recovery.

VII. ART.

The art of the will is action; of the intellect, thought. The prophet speaks, the saint lives, the Divine Word. The literature of each is sublimely epic. The Gods are heroic.

VIII. BEAUTY.

Beauty is the health of Goodness.

IX. DISTRUST.

Faithless and blind! who strowest distrust and lookest for faith. Doth the husk yield the kernel; corruption, incorruption? Impossible. Faith alone yieldeth faith; hope springs forth from the bosom of hope. Plant then your hope if you would reap fruition. Your faith quickens as your doubt perishes. Life leaves death behind alway; the Lord of life ascendeth from the sepulchres alway.

X. REGENERATION.

The Belly is not less the soul's mediator than the brain, heart, hand. Except a man be indeed born of water and of spirit, he deceases and corrupts in the sludge of concupiscence. Body and soul must alike be regenerate and baptized in the soul of purity, incarnated and clarified by the influences of the Holy Ghost. Life is the regimen of the soul; habits, sacramental rites, ministering to its salvation or doom. Whether ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, imbrutes or glorifies. Let all your functions mediate; all your faculties hallow; all your acts deify your soul.

XI. LUCRE.

Bread! there is alway enough and to spare in the granaries of Providence. But covetousness has driven long a prosperous business in the world; monopolized the hunger and thirst, the nakedness and exposure of mankind; and held a market for selling the flesh and blood of human beings. Bodies are everywhere bought and sold. Mammon, in league with slaughter, carnage, lust, forestalls the breath of souls; the Babe even at the breast is mortgaged to cancel the debts of the needy. Air, light, fire, fuel, water, earth, home, the grave even; heaven, hell; — all, are stock in trade of the house of Mammon, Beelzebub and Co.; which emboldened by its gains, plots always speculations, daring and impious, appropriating the Godhead even to transmute his attributes into gold, and would melt the universe to fill the vaults of Plutus. God and the world, all things, are coined, all things sold.

XII. BENEFICENCE.

God hath, and is all things; yet gives all things, himself, away. Go, churl, and do thou likewise.

Art. V. — *Letter from Mr. Brisbane in reply to the Editor's remarks on Mr. Fourier's system.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Dear Sir, — The July Number of your valuable Review contained an article entitled "Social Evils and their Remedy," in which you spoke of the System of Fourier in such a way, as to leave upon the mind of the reader a very contracted idea of its extent and importance. I regret this, as your Review circulates, no doubt, among the most liberal minds of the country, — among Men well prepared to embrace the great doctrine of a Social Reform. Permit me to make

a few remarks upon your article, and to call through your pages the attention of conscientious Inquirers, who feel deeply the want of a solution of the grand problem of Man and his Destiny, to the scientific discoveries of Fourier. Those persons who cannot obtain his works, or who do not read French, can consult my work, entitled "*Social Destiny of Man,*" which contains a general view of his system.

You observe (page 269) that Fourier proposes to get rid of the antagonism, which actually exists in the individual, society, by harmonizing the passions, and that his scheme therefore may be called a scheme of *passional* harmony.

This, however, is but a small part and a detail of the vast social doctrine, which he has given to the world. He has founded the true *Science of Society*, as Copernicus founded the true Science of Astronomy, and he has discovered the laws and organization of a Social Order, which is based upon fixed laws in the moral or intellectual world, and which can be demonstrated with the precision of a mathematical problem. His discoveries led him to see that the passions are capable of harmony, provided they are developed in a social order suited to them; if they are not, no social unity and harmony are possible, for the passions are the active agents, the springs, wheels, &c., so to say, of society.

The discerning of the true laws of society must be the achievement of human Genius. The Divinity does not reveal this knowledge to Man any more than he reveals to him the science of chemistry, mathematics, or astronomy. This is the reason why it has been so long delayed; the enormous mass of prejudices which have always existed with regard to human nature, the fatal belief, that it was inherently defective, — that it was depraved and vicious, have prevented human reason from fulfilling its task, and discovering the Social Destiny of Man.

Moralists, philosophers, and legislators, seeing the passions perverted by a false order of things, and shocked at the discords and enormities, which they engender in

their deranged and perverted action, have supposed that the Evil was in man, — not in the social organization. They have charged in consequence upon the passions, — upon "poor and depraved human nature," as they term it, the conflicts, vices, and crimes which have marked the course of human societies, and which should rest alone upon their false social systems. Those systems harass, misdirect, and thwart in a thousand ways the true and natural tendencies of the passions, which are consequently falsely or discordantly developed, and offer us a reversed image of their true development. They engender at present as much discord and depravity, as they would, in a true social order, produce harmony and virtue.

The fatal, and at the same time superficial belief, that the passions are bad or naturally discordant, which has been such an obstacle to social science, is easily dissipated, if we once understand that the passions are subject to a two-fold mode of development or action, — one of which is *true*, the other false; the one discordant, the other harmonious. Observers of man have not had the perspicuity to see that the passions were subject, *like every active power or agent*, to this double movement. *They have in consequence mistaken false and perverted effects of passions for the passions themselves*, and have supposed that envy, hatred, revenge, jealousy, &c., were original sentiments placed by the Creator in the soul of man. As a series of false societies have existed on the earth, the passions have always appeared in their false development; and the continued persecution, which results from this false development, has led the world to suppose, that *it was the only one of which they were capable.* As a consequence they have been condemned as naturally bad.

Instead of condemning the passions, — the most perfect work of the Divinity on this earth, — we should condemn our false societies, which are the work of philosophers and legislators. But philosophers and legislators have had more confidence in their work than in God's, and instead of blaming their social laws and

institutions, they have heaped upon MAN the dark load of injustice, vice, and degradation, which should rest alone on their false theories and doctrines.

The condemnation of Man has gone on from age to age, until he has become degraded in his own eyes, and the doctrine of the depravity of human nature has been firmly established.

This blasphemous doctrine, this practical atheism, is the foundation on which all past and present societies have been, and are based; and we see in their disastrous and odious results a true picture of their outrageous foundation, insulting alike to the wisdom of the Divinity and the dignity of man.

FOURIER, guided in his researches by a higher and clearer view, and by an *integral* faith in the Providence of the Divinity, cast a deep and searching glance into the scheme of creation. Instead of condemning Man and the passions, he bowed down before this manifestation of the wisdom of God, and commenced a patient and laborious analysis of the deep and benighted question of the human passions, or the science of man. For seven years he labored at it with that inveterate perseverance which characterized his mind, — at times half driven to doubt, and distraction by the difficulties to be overcome, — but he solved the problem, and solved it triumphantly. He discovered the great Law of *Attractions proportional to Destinies*, which is the only true guide in the study of social questions, and the laws which govern the action of the passions, — *the Series of Groups.* From those laws he deduced an organization of society, and a system of social institutions, suited to Man and the Destiny he is to fulfil on this earth.

To solve this problem, it was necessary to discover the Destiny of Man and the Function assigned him by the Divinity in the scale of Creation; the relation of Mind, or the intellectual Principle in the universe, to matter; the law of Duality of Movement, (or two-fold mode of Development of all powers and active agents;) the theory of Transitions, (which contains an explana-

tion of the cause of Evil,) and the laws of the *Aromal* Kingdom. (The aromal kingdom comprises those invisible, imponderable fluids, a few of which are known to science under the names of magnetism, galvanism, electricity, &c.)

It is of course impossible to enter here into any explanation of these various subjects, but they, who have studied them, and comprehend the whole scope of Fourier's vast researches, will feel the truth and grandeur of the following declaration.

"Up to the present time we have only been able to admire in the works of Man (in Architecture, Art, Industry, &c.) the *material beautiful.* For the first time we shall see the *passional beautiful,* (the Harmony of the Passions,) see the Creator in person and in all his wisdom — for what is the spirit, the wisdom of the Divinity, if it be not the Harmony of the twelve Passions, their complete development without any conflict, and in as perfect an accord as that of an excellent orchestra? This beautiful work is the only one which can give Mankind an idea of the glory and wisdom of the Divinity.

"We see at present His material wisdom which bursts forth in the Harmony of the celestial spheres, and in the Mechanism of created things; but we have no idea of His Political and Social wisdom. Of the Social Movement we have no other examples than those of our false Societies, in the fraud, pillage, and oppressions of which there breathes a demoniac spirit. We shall only see the spirit of God in the Harmony of the *Passional Series* in their unity, their virtues, and in the charm which stimulates them unceasingly to useful Industry."

Philosophers and legislators, having condemned the Passions, have had of necessity to resort to repression and constraint to keep them in subjection. To attain the most order and harmony possible in society, they have undertaken, to *moralize* the individual, and to repress and suppress those passions, which they considered bad. It is to the idea of the necessity of *Constraint* that the

world owes the hundreds of moral theories and codes of laws, (with their practical means of enforcement — prisons, scaffolds, racks, gibbets, &c.,) which have been devised for its government, and which have resulted in the Social chaos that now exists on the globe.

Moralists have sanctioned this system of constraint and repression, and to it they have added worst of all inconsistencies; for often having condemned the human race collectively, they wish to reform the *Individual!!*

This complication of error has completely bewildered the human mind; — so much so that the most religious minds have lost faith in the integrity of Providence; and Reformers of the most enlarged views do not think of pursuing a policy different from the old worn out one of philosophers and legislators, who have been constantly striving to force man to adapt himself to society, instead of adapting society to man. That they did not see, in the present turbulent, depraved, and discordant development of the passions, the germs (inverted it is true) of a brilliant social and passional harmony, is not surprising; for having accepted the superficial doctrine, that the Divinity could not or did not choose to create anything more perfect than the depraved Being called civilized Man, they of course could only see imperfection and frailty in him.

Let us here remark that we do not look upon Man *as we find him in the Barbarian and Civilized Societies* as perfect. Far from it. We consider him a poor and undeveloped Being, nine tenths of whose faculties and talents are perverted or lie dormant; whose higher intellectual powers are not called out, (which is most important to counterbalance or give a useful direction to the sensual tendencies or passions,) and to whom no elevated objects and functions are offered to excite in him a love of the beautiful and the true, which is the best means of directing the mind from sensuality.

What is a man whose higher intellectual faculties are undeveloped? An incomplete being, deprived of the inward light which God gave him to guide him, and wandering in mental darkness. Place such a being in

a society like the present one, termed civilization, which is full of allurements, temptations, and pitfalls; — his sensual passions alone developed, for of course something will find development, — then tell him to move on through the thousand shoals of social life, and what is the result? Why he commits excesses, runs into discords and vices, for the present state of things seems calculated expressly to engulph the individual, and he falls. Then your whining moralist and theorist send forth their piteous moans over "poor fallen human nature," which are well echoed by a deep, universal moan of suffering, that goes forth from a harassed and miserable Race, who plead for wiser, truer guides to lead them out of the social labyrinth, in which they are blindly wandering.

Your strong denunciations, Mr. Brownson, of these incompetent guides of mankind, will keep you, I hope, from following in any way in their paths. I regret to find, however, that while you do not condemn man as depraved or vicious, you look upon him nevertheless as incomplete, or rather as imperfect, but progressive and tending to perfection. I say, I regret this; because supposing the idea, that Man is good and the passions are capable of Harmony, is an Utopia, it is better to take it up and speculate upon it, than to continue speculating upon an old dogma, which has engendered since the commencement of history nothing but indigence, fraud, oppression, and carnage, and which keeps our legislative and moral tinkers continually patching up their systems of constraint and repression, which are found such ineffectual barriers to the innumerable varieties of vice and crime, that the practical operation of society is constantly producing.

As I have not space to enter into an examination of the theory of the Passions, so as to show scientifically that they are capable of harmony, I will merely examine some of the objections which you raise to the possibility of such a Harmony, in order to counteract, if possible, the influence which they may have had upon the minds of your readers, and induce them to

examine with impartiality the original and profound discoveries of Fourier.

You observe (page 269), "Each passion seeks its own gratification, and can rarely obtain it without thwarting another." This is perfectly true *in our present societies.* Ambition, or the pride of rank and fortune, thwarts love, and love disappoints ambition; the desire of gain thwarts friendship, and the passion, paternity, leads to selfishness, and is in conflict with most of the other passions. But we must not take our present societies as the standard by which to judge of the action and operation of the passions. They are at present falsely developed, and are all in conflict. But the regularity and method, which everywhere exist in the disorder and perversion of the passions in our false societies, are a proof that a system can be devised in which they will produce order and harmony.

You say, "It is impossible, for example, to harmonize benevolence and the love of accumulation; for the one finds its gratification in giving away, the other in acquiring and hoarding." This is an error. In Association, based upon a system of sharehold property, which produces unity of interests, each individual can only forward his interests by forwarding those of all the other members, and all the other members can only forward these by forwarding his; as a consequence mutual good feeling and well wishing will exist. Besides at present no one accumulates merely to keep; (there may be here and there a very rare exception, which only confirms the general rule;) a man accumulates to give away, — to offspring or persons he loves,— or for ambition's sake; but establish numerous and varied ties between each individual and all the members of an association, and open to him various avenues to rank and distinction, and we will see that the love of accumulation will in no wise conflict with those passions, which you term the social, disinterested, heroic. — The great error, which is committed, is taking our present societies as the unvarying and sole measure, by which to judge of man and all social effects; —

because they pervert the passions, we suppose that they will always be perverted; and because they produce discord, we suppose that discord will always exist.

"Nature," again you say, "is no economist. She secures her ends by an excessive expenditure of means. The end she proposes to secure by any given passion is always good and sacred, but in order to secure it, she lavishes the passion in excess. Take the passion of love, given to secure the continuance of the species. Wherever this passion exists in sufficient strength and activity to ensure the end for which it was given, it exists in a degree that would push us beyond that end."

To answer this objection fully, it would be necessary to enter into a long explanation. This I cannot here do, and will therefore limit myself to a few remarks. In our present societies very little development and satisfaction are given to most of the passions. How slightly, for example, are friendship and ambition satisfied? The consequence is that an excessive development is given to those passions, which can be gratified, — among others, to material love, and to eating. Leave the mind unoccupied, and every passion which is aroused in it will of course absorb its entire energy and run into excesses.

Could we strip the earth of all its verdure, and plant upon it one species of tree or vegetable, that species would soon cover its entire surface. A true system of agriculture will prevent the excessive spreading of any particular variety of plant, by cultivating all varieties and kinds; and a true system of society will, by developing properly all the faculties, talents, and passions in man, maintain equilibrium, and prevent any particular one from running to excess.

The passion, love, was not given to man merely to secure the continuance of the species; it was given to him to regulate the relations of the sexes. Intellectual love, which is so much the nobler part of the passion,*

* True; but we were not speaking of intellectual love, nor of *platonic* love, but of love as a mere sexual appetite. We have not lived forty years without learning that there is a higher love. — Ed.

is not necessary even to propagate the species, as we see in the case of animals; and neither intellectual nor material love is necessary in the vegetable kingdom.

It certainly cannot be charged upon nature that she is no economist, and is lavish of her means as regards intellectual love, — that noble passion, which combines admiration, reverence, and affection. There is not, nor ever has been a thousandth part enough of it in our societies; and it is to the absence of it that we must attribute in part that coarseness, vulgarity, use of low language, and tendency to groveling pleasures, which we find so common, even among the rich, and that want of respect and deference to, and often rudeness and brutality towards, the female sex.

Love is one of the most beautiful of the passions; it is implanted in us to elevate and ennoble the relations of the sexes, to give charm to life and refinement to our social intercourse. The Creator, who is a supreme economist, and who always connects the *useful* with the *beautiful*, has connected with and assigned to this passion the important and useful functions of the continuance of the species, which heightens and gives a deep endearing charm to it; but he has not created it by any means for the sole purpose of perpetuating the Race. To explain my idea, I will make use of a simile. Was the peach created, merely that it might contain within it a stone, which could be planted and produce a tree? No; but as the Creator connects, as I remarked, the useful with the beautiful, he has imbedded in that delightful fruit a stone, which *may be used*, if necessary, for that purpose.

Another view which you advance is the following;

> "Man is a musical instrument that can neither be put nor kept in perfect tune. He was made for progress. Progress consists in overcoming disharmony; and unless it is one day to cease, implies that disharmony can never be entirely overcome."

Is the Progress, let us ask, which man is to accomplish on the earth, and of which so much is talked and

written, to take place internally, — in the individual, or is it to be external and take place in the outward world? If it is to be internal, — in his own nature, then man should, it strikes me, bundle himself up like a silkworm, and accomplish it in whatever way he may be destined so to do. But if man is to accomplish some great progress in the outward world, then he should have received from the Divinity a definite physical and passional (or intellectual) organization, adapted to the accomplishment of that progress.

Such undoubtedly is the case. His physical organization and his passions are the same now, that they were four thousand years ago, and as they will be undoubtedly for ten thousand years to come. The only influence which the progress, he has to accomplish, has upon his individual nature, is to open to it a broader field of action, and to enable his passions and faculties to develop themselves, and act according to their true and legitimate tendencies.

The progress which man has to accomplish is in the external world. It consists in cultivating and embellishing the globe, of which he is the OVERSEER, and which is a noble Domain confided to his care; in developing all its varied resources and riches; in perfecting the animal and vegetable Kingdoms; in effacing discords and establishing harmonies, and in stamping upon the material world the impress and perfection of his Intellectual nature, and in performing on the planet or sphere, over which he presides, that grand work of Harmony and Intelligence, which God is performing in the infinite universe.

In addition to this, man has to discover the laws of universal Science, or laws which govern the scheme of creation, in which is accomplished the science of society, or the principles of a true social organization, and which, if once discovered and established, will guarantee to his passions a true and harmonious development, and direct him rightly in the attainment of his Destiny.

The Human Race are placed upon the earth both

weak and ignorant; they have neither shelter, nor covering, nor implements, nor machinery, nor fertilized fields, nor knowledge to direct them in inventing the means of obtaining them.

The Divinity has delivered the globe into their hands in a rude state, covered with dense forests, wild plains and valleys, deserts and marshes, and the animal and vegetable kingdoms in a vigorous but undeveloped condition.

Such is the commencement; the Human Race are placed upon the planet, ignorant and without a true system of society, and without Industry or the means of cultivating the globe and performing their Trust of Overseer.

They must raise themselves from their primitive ignorance to universal science; and they must take the planet in its wild state, cultivate and embellish it, clear it of its vast forests, fertilize its burning deserts, drain its miasmatic marshes, dike and regulate its streams, perfect the animal and vegetable creations, bring forth its varied riches and natural harmonies, and make of it a magnificent terrestrial abode, worthy of God who created in germ all its beauties, and of the genius of Man which is charged with developing them.

Here is an immense progress to accomplish, a mighty undertaking to perform. Is it probable, I ask, that the Divinity has created an imperfect being to execute so mighty a work, and entrusted to a poor and imperfect creature, in conflict and discord with himself, so high a function? No; the sentiment of the *fitness of universal things*, which the soul conceives instinctively, says No.

The human Race have not advanced far, it is true, in their great work. Not having discovered a true system of society, their energy and activity have been misdirected, and their passions falsely developed. They have been engaged in war and devastation, and neglected their true function. The Greek and Roman world sunk exhausted under its ceaseless conflicts and commotions; and it has been left to modern civiliza-

tion to commence anew, the development of Industry, and the Arts and Sciences, and the grand work of Progress. The Race have now the implements, the materials, wherewith to move on towards the accomplishment of their Destiny; their judgment has become a good deal matured by experience; they see that progress is their law; that a grand Work is before them; and that the pursuit of trivial or pernicious objects, such as mere individual happiness and war, which have heretofore occupied their attention and efforts, must give way to greater and nobler undertakings.

The first and most important step now to be taken is to discover and establish a true system of society, which will direct the labor, energy, and genius of the Race, to the great objects mentioned above, as effectually as they have heretofore been directed to war, pillage, and destruction. Fourier has, I believe, discovered the principles of such a society; it consists in a system of Association based upon Attractive Industry, unity of action and interests, and harmony of the passions, (or the directing of the passions to their true and legitimate objects of activity). A practical trial of the system can be made on a small scale, and without overthrowing states and the whole established order of things. If the first trial succeeds, it will spread rapidly, and become general by its inherent superiority over the present social organization; it will produce as great a reform in Industry and the practical interests of mankind, as the discoveries of Copernicus and Galileo produced in Astronomy, or the mariner's compass and the steam-boat produced in navigation. Association and Attractive Industry will set the human Race upon the right track, which, in their false social wanderings, they have not yet discovered.

The questions of Progress and the Harmony of the passions are two vast subjects, which to be understood, would require an elaborate and thorough analysis. What I have said can give of course very little idea of them, and I will close my remarks with one or two more observations.

You say, "Man is a musical instrument, that can neither be put, nor kept in perfect tune." Now let me ask, if man can establish harmonies in sounds, in hues and colors, in flavors, in mechanical constructions, and in various other departments, is it not surprising that God cannot establish harmony in the passions, *provided he wishes so to do?* And if he does not wish it, is it not equally surprizing that he should prefer to create an imperfect and discordant being, with passions which lead him astray, — often to perdition, and with no other means of regulating them than constraint and repression, which in most cases are inefficient; — and then place at the termination of his earthly career eternal punishment, if he falls, which in a majority of cases he does!!

Advocates of the doctrine of human perversity cannot extricate themselves from the numerous contradictions into which they fall, by saying that Man was created good, but that he fell. His fall was in the social or political world, and led to that general derangement and perversion of the passions of which I have spoken, — not in his organic nature. He is bodily and mentally as he was when he came from the hands of God; and over his organic system, or nature, he has no control. The social system in which he lives may change *the development* of those active agents, called passions, within him, but it cannot change *those agents themselves.* It requires better proofs than moralists and philosophers have heretofore brought, to show that Man is a defective, depraved, or discordant being, and that their policy of reforming him with theories of constraint, self-denial, damnation, &c., instead of reforming society, is the true one.

I will say with Fourier; let them comprehend in detail the social Order to which Man is destined, and they will see that the Creator has known perfectly well in what manner to create the passions, so as to be adapted to social unity and harmony; that he would be wrong to change them to please Seneca or Plato; and that human reason instead of criticising his work,

should exert itself to discover a social system suited to them. All their systems of repression and constraint will not change them, and they will constantly produce evil and discord in a false system of society, as they will produce virtue and harmony in a true system.

You say that the harmony of the passions, so far as attainable, is to be obtained by following the Christian rule, deny thyself, which, you add, is poorly substituted by Fourier's rule, please thyself.

Fourier's system is not an Epicurean doctrine of individual pleasure; its object is not to secure to the human race *individually* a mere personal happiness, by the cautious calculations of self-denial, or by a headlong satisfaction of the passions. Man was not placed upon the earth for so contracted and insignificant an end; he was placed upon it to perform a grand work of order, unity, and regulation; — to be its intelligent overseer, — not a mere seeker of self-gratification, — and to exercise, in the sphere over which he presides, the eternal harmonizing and perfecting influence of intelligence upon matter. Develop all his faculties and talents, arouse his energies, open to him a broad sphere of action, give him noble and congenial objects of activity, and he will be happy.

It is a law, that whenever the Divinity requires the performance of a function from a being, he connects the happiness of the being with it.

Let man perform his Trust of Overseer, execute the great works connected with it, and fulfil his Destiny, and he will be rewarded by happiness. But he now does not perform his Trust; he has deviated from his Destiny; he is occupied with trivial or baneful works, and he is miserable. In his deviation from his Destiny, his faculties, talents, and passions find no elevated, noble, and congenial objects of activity, and the consequence is, that they run wild, fasten upon false or pernicious objects, or remain in a state of stagnation, which engenders corruption and innumerable perversions. He is besides surrounded in the outward world by poverty, disorder, and temptations, which add to the

derangement of his passions and faculties. In such a state of things, a very guarded development or repression, and even something of the passional energies, are very important and necessary. If the passions cannot be rightly directed, they of course must be kept down, and there is no other alternative. Self-denial then becomes valuable as a palliative, but it is in its essence nothing more than a palliative, a wise selfishness, and useful only in a period of Transition. Let the Human Race discover their Destiny, let them bend all their energies to its fulfilment, and those barriers which moralists and legislators have raised against the useless, pernicious, and surplus activity of the passions, and which are looked upon with so much respect, will be found useless, and be forgotten.

My object in writing this letter has been more to excite curiosity, than to give explanations. I wish to call attention to the profound and comprehensive discoveries of Fourier, and induce those, who are seeking conscientiously for effectual remedies for present social evils, to examine attentively his system. Suppose his scheme of passional Harmony is not true, it does not undermine his doctrine; the possibility of harmonizing the passions is an important feature of it, as it is of social order and unity, but it is only a branch, — a detail of his vast system.

Let us examine what he has done besides. He has discovered and matured a plan of Association, in which vast economies can be effected; unity of action and interests established; a free development given to individual character; all rights and legitimate feelings, such as individual property, the religious sentiment, the family tie, &c. respected, and a boundless field opened to the exercise of personal liberty.

He has discovered a system of Property, which will conciliate the individual with the collective interest; the desire of private gain with public good; maintain all individual rights; guarantee to every one the chance of an easy acquisition of property; prevent the abuses and tyranny of individual property as now established,

and do away with those causes of law-suits and litigations which exist so abundantly at present.

He has discovered a new Organization of Industry, by means of which it can be rendered honorable and *Attractive.* His system of *Attractive Industry* is one of his most brilliant practical discoveries, and it should alone, as it no doubt will, confer upon his name an imperishable glory. — But two systems of Labor or Industry have existed on the earth. — Slave Labor and Labor for Wages. The first system makes use of the lash and punishments to force men to toil; the second, of want and starvation to attain the same end. Both systems are a disgrace to the leaders of the world, and Fourier, who has repaired their ignorance and neglect, and discovered a third system which will strip Industry of the repulsiveness and degradation now attached to it, and will render it honorable and attractive, has confered an unappreciable benefit upon the toiling millions whose days are now spent in the dreary drudgery of our societes.

He has discovered a System of Education, which will call out all the faculties, talents, and capacities of the child; initiate it at an early age into the practical pursuits of Industry, and later into the sciences; make it physically and intellectually a fully developed being,— all that the Creator intended it should be, — not a poor, undeveloped creature, nine tenths of whose intellectual powers are perverted or smothered, as is the case with nine hundred and ninety-nine children out of one thousand at present, and give it its rights, its place in society, its function to perform there, and its independence. Fourier's system will guaranty to the child the Right of a complete practical and scientific education, and to the Man the Right to Labor, or Right of taking part in all those occupations for which his education has prepared him.

Besides these practical discoveries, a part only of which I have mentioned, Fourier's scientific or theoretical Labors, on which his practical system is based,

have resulted in the discovery of some most important Laws in the moral or intellectual world.

1. The great Law of Attractions proportional to Destinies, which is an unerring guide in the study of social questions, a perfect standard or measure by which to judge of the truths and value of social systems and institutions, and one of the principal proofs of the immortality of the soul.

2. The Law of Duality of Movement, the Law of Exceptions and theory of Transitions, without which it is impossible to explain the cause of past and present evil, which has existed and still exists on the earth, and to reconcile the wisdom of the Divinity with the misery and disorder which we see in the world around us.

3. The Law of Universal Analogy, which gives us the key to the relation of mind to matter, — of God to the material universe.

4. The full and complete theory of Attraction, which is the sole agent of God in the regulation of the material as well as the intellectual or moral universe. The theory of material attraction has been in part discovered by Kepler and Newton ; Fourier has extended it to the intellectual (or strictly speaking, social and passional) world. It is by this theory that is proved scientifically the truth of Attractive Industry.

5. The Laws which regulate the Material, Organic, *Aromal* (electro-magnetic) kingdoms, and of social organizations. (See page 161 of Social Destiny of Man.)

Fourier devoted forty years to the discovery and elaboration of the vast system which he has given to the world, and they, who comprehend it in all its branches, can alone judge of his merits and the honor which should be paid to his genius.

But if we sweep away all his scientific labors, if we pronounce his system of Association and Attractive Industry, and his scientific discoveries to be false, still his profound and searching Analysis of society, his just and vigorous criticisms of its monstrous defects and abuses, and his demonstration of its falseness and the

artificial foundation on which it is based, will rank him as the most profound analytical genius that the world has ever produced, and entitle him to the thanks and honors of mankind.

I remain, Dear Sir,
Your friend and wellwisher,
ALBERT BRISBANE.

[We willingly insert the above communication from a man, whose zeal in the cause of social reform we sincerely honor. We have no disposition to detract from the merits of Mr. Fourier, although we do not agree with him in his philosophy of human nature. His doctrine concerning attractive industry, if not of groups and series, we most cordially embrace, and had advocated in our own writings years before ever we had heard of Mr. Fourier. That a system of attractive industry, in some form, must finally be substituted for the present systems of slave labor, and of labor at wages, has long been our settled conviction. We go farther. We hesitate not to avow our full and decided conviction, that a system of attractive industry, must embrace the principle of association, and of associations larger than the family, and smaller than the state, associations which will constitute each by itself a unit or element of the political order. But, that Mr. Fourier has conceived the best possible plan of these associations, we are not convinced; nor are we convinced that the social reformer should labor directly for the formation of them. It seems to us that when the world is ripe for them, they will form themselves, spontaneously as it were. They must come, whenever they do come, as the necessary development of that which immediately precedes. In the mean time, we wish all success to those of our friends who are trying the experiment. So far from throwing obstacles in their way, we would do all in our power to aid them. — ED.]

ART. VI. — *History of the Colonization of the United States.* By GEORGE BANCROFT. Abridged by the Author. Boston: Little and Brown. 1841. 2 vols. 16mo.

OUR official relations with the author of this History have heretofore rendered it indelicate for us to speak of the work in terms suitable to its merits. We were also too desirous of witnessing its unbounded success, to be found commending it, when all the world were clamoring against us. But as those relations have ceased to subsist, as the public clamor against us is subsiding, and as there is no danger, in this community at least, that Mr. Bancroft will be held responsible for our heresies, we are now free to speak as we think and feel.

We would not write so foul a libel on our own judgment and taste, as to say that we do not fully coincide with the high and flattering opinions, which have been almost universally expressed of this History, both at home and abroad. It deservedly ranks, we will not say the first, but among the very first historical productions of the age, and of an age peculiarly rich in historical productions, so rich, and so original in its point of view, that it may almost be said to be the first age that has ever really written history. It is, with the exception of Mr. Prescott's admirable work on Ferdinand and Isabella, the only really historical work this country has produced.

Of all species of composition History is the highest and most difficult, requiring the highest order of genius, and the most various and varied qualifications and acquisitions. The Historian must judge all, and therefore know all, — philosophy, art, science, religion, politics, industry, and know them in detail as well as in their generality; or else he will give us a mere chronicle of events, as remote from true history as barren of instruction and interest. Mr. Bancroft possesses the requisite qualifications of an historian in an eminent degree. He combines in his work the splendor of Gibbon, the erudition of Heeren, the philosophy of Guizot, the graceful and winning narrative of Thierry, the life and movement of Thiers, and a warmth of feeling, a poetry of description, and a picturesqueness of expression peculiarly his own.

The portions of his work, aside from his descriptions of natural scenery and sketches of individual characters, which strike us as most felicitous in execution, are those in which he gives a general view of the march of ideas and events in the old world, connects them with, and shows their bearing on American History. In these he shows that he has studied general history, not less successfully than he has the history of his own country. In this, he has pursued the true method. No man can, properly speaking, write the history of any one epoch, or of any one country, without having studied profoundly the History of the world, ascertained the general march of mankind, and the position occupied in the general development of the race by the particular epoch, or the particular country of which he proposes to write.

We regard it as a high merit in Mr. Bancroft's History, that it is written under the profound conviction, that Humanity, in its progress through the ages, is developing and realizing a grand providential idea, plan, or purpose. Each age, each nation has its especial mission assigned it in advance, in the grand scheme of Divine providence, a scheme which embraces all its ideas and events, from the most comprehensive to the most minute.

This country has its Idea, and its Mission. Its Idea is Liberty, not of the king, the hierarch, the noble, the merchant-prince, but of man, under both his spiritual and his material relations. Its Mission is the practical realization of Liberty in this broad sense for the human race. Hence with us all events are significant or insignificant according to their bearing on Liberty. Following out this Idea, Mr. Bancroft groups all the details of our history around the Idea of Liberty, at greater or less distances, according to their rela-

tive influence in advancing or retarding its progress. In this way he renders our History really instructive, and reproduces it in its epic character. In this way he secures that unity and order in his narrative, which would otherwise be wanting, in an account of the establishment and growth of a large number of scattered and independent Colonies.

Mr. Bancroft not only writes his history under the influence of the true American Idea, but he takes that Idea in a large and generous sense. The Freedom, he loves and pursues with the unwearied assiduity of a true lover, is freedom of mind, and freedom of the people. He says with Descartes, *cogito, ergo sum,* I am sovereign of my thought; no man can touch it, and whosoever would restrain it, or infringe its free and honest utterance is no true man. The freedom of the people is the natural result of freedom of thought. For if every man have that within him, which no man may control, if in fact every man is within the sphere of his own being a sovereign, then the freedom of all, which is nothing but the sovereignty of each, must be recognised.

Thus far, we can speak in terms of unqualified praise of Mr. Bancroft's History. But we either see or seem to see a view implied in his conception of the freedom of the people, which we hold to be unsound, and even dangerous. He does not seem to us to keep always distinct in his mind the wide difference there is in reality, between the freedom of the people as the body politic, as a commonwealth, and the freedom of the people as individuals. He therefore welcomes always whatever tends to enlarge the power of the people in their collective capacity, as an event auspicious to liberty. But, on this point, he has rather followed out the abstract idea of democracy, as the student conceives it in his closet, than the idea of democracy as it is conceived and limited by the wise and practical statesman. No friend of liberty, in Mr. Bancroft's or in any worthy sense of the term, can be a democrat, except when democracy is defined to be a form of government, which secures, to each and every member of the community, the free and full enjoyment of all his natural rights. A pure democracy, which is nothing but the unlimited freedom of the people as the commonwealth to do whatsoever it pleases, can never secure this end. It is an absolute government, as much so as an absolute monarchy, and in our judgment not a whit better, if even so good.

In an absolute democracy, such as Mr. Bancroft seems to us to contemplate, where the people are absolutely sovereign, with none but moral limitations to their power, the stronger interest will always command a majority of votes, govern the government, and therefore through the government have always the means of strengthening and perpetuating itself. The government will always be made the instrument for protecting special interests, and it is by protecting special interests that government encroaches on the rights of the citizen; because the favor it bestows on one part is always taken from the other parts.

We need not tell Mr. Bancroft, for no man knows better than he, that the great evil of all governments consists in granting special

favors, in protecting, as it is called, particular interests. But what remedy has he in his democracy for this evil? He has nothing on which to rely, but the wisdom and justice of the sovereign. Need we tell him, that he who lies at the mercy of his sovereign, who has nothing but the wisdom and justice of his sovereign on which to rely for the protection of his rights, is, in theory and in fact, no free man, but a slave?

Mr. Bancroft may hope to remedy the evil by new elections, by trusting to the "sober second thought of the people." But this "sober second thought" does not come till the next morning, and the constitution had been ruined in the debauch of the preceding evening. Your sober second thoughts come too late, for they come not till the mischief is consummated. Then as for new elections, in a pure democracy, they can amount to nothing. The stronger interest always predominates in the election, and packs the legislature with men pledged to its especial protection. We should much admire to see a legislature in Massachusetts not returned by the banking, and corporation interests, or interests which banks and corporations represent. What we want is a limited democracy; that is to say, a limit to the power of the people as the state, so that the government can never get any more power than all the interests of the community fully represented, and each therefore neutralizing the other, will mutually consent that it shall exercise. Or in other words, we want some limitation to the sovereign power, so that it not only *will* not, but *cannot*, act on any matters but those of general concernment. We therefore agree with the old Federal party in demanding a limit to the democracy, but we dissent from that party in its wish to limit it by the aristocracy. We would limit it not in favor of kings, nobles, gentlemen, or simplemen; but in favor of the citizen, — not against liberty, but in favor of it.

We are far from saying that Mr. Bancroft does not contemplate the liberty of the citizen, as well as of the state; but he seems to us to think, that the freedom of the citizen is necessarily secured by establishing the absolute freedom of the people as the commonwealth. On this point, we think, he has fallen into the mistake into which most of our politicians fall. Indeed in this he adopts the popular creed of the country, a creed from which liberty has more to fear than from all other causes combined,—a creed which no man can combat without being denounced as a political heretic, and which affords so many facilities to the political demagogue, that no man desirous of power or place will venture to question it. Courtiers are always the same, whether the sovereign be a gilded doll in a palace, or an unwashed mob in the streets. They always study to extend the sovereign's power, both that they may flatter him, and furnish him with the means of conferring the larger favors on them. The evil with us is becoming great and alarming, and unless some check be put to it, or some guard against its natural consequences provided, Mr. Bancroft himself may live to record in an appendix to his History, the mournful tale of the failure of our Republic to realize the hopes of its friends.

We have another fault to find with this History, growing out of

Mr. Bancroft's excessive democracy. His sympathy with the people; or his devout worship of abstract democracy, leads him sometimes to cast too far into the shade the failings of those who contributed to its establishment. His account of our Puritan fathers would hardly give a reader of American History a true conception of them. His picture has the lights but not the shades of truth. In a desire to bring the Quakers into the democratic brotherhood, he has misconceived some of their real characteristics. His chapter on the Quakers is one of the most splendid chapters in English composition, but it does not give us genuine Quakerism. The Inner Light of the Quaker is not identical with Reason, as a faculty of human nature, but with Reason as the WORD of God; that is, it is the Reason of God, and not the Reason of man. But faults of this kind are, after all, faults which "lean to virtue's side," and spring from the sunniness of Mr. Bancroft's heart, which spreads a rich and golden hue over whatever he contemplates.

This same sympathy with the people, and desire to defend the democracy, has led him in his account of Salem Witchcraft, as it is called, to maintain, at considerable length, but not successfully as it seems to us, that the prosecutions which took place were gotten up by the aristocracy, and generally discountenanced by the people. But the people at that time were firm believers in witches, and also firm believers in the fact, that they were commanded by God not to suffer a witch to live. Their own earnest faith would have led them to prosecute the suspected, without any undue influence on the part of the aristocracy. Moreover the multitude are always clamorous for such prosecutions. We have even ourselves personally known them restrained from prosecuting, or at least *lynching* some two or three individuals for witchcraft, only through the influence of some of the more enlightened and influential members of the community. The belief in witches still subsists to a great extent in the country. The writer of this was brought up to believe in them as devoutly as in his Maker; and we have seen more than one door over which the horse-shoe was nailed to prevent their ingress. We think the prosecutions in the Salem tragedy should be ascribed to the ignorance and fanaticism of the multitude, more than to the sinister designs of Stoughton and Cotton Mather, and their abrupt terminus, we conjecture, was mainly owing to the fact, that they were about to strike some whom the multitude honored.

We confess that for ourselves we have no more faith in the maxim that "the people can do no wrong," than we have in its elder brother, "the king can do no wrong." Both are fictions, and neither is a harmless fiction. Men taken individually we confide in, and honor, and love; for as individuals, there are few that are utterly worthless. But taken collectively, we distrust them. The more attenuated responsibility is by the numbers there are to share it, the weaker it becomes. Unite men in a corporation, and they will applaud themselves for doing in their corporate capacity, what they would shrink from with horror as individuals. Enlarge your corporation till it become a State, and you have increased the evil, not diminished it.

The multitude are never the first to discover, to welcome, or to support, even the principles which make for their own salvation. Every reformer knows by sad experience that his most obstinate enemies are those for whose especial welfare he is ready to lay down his life. Jefferson had to defend his doctrines of equality against hand-cart-men, hod-men, and wood-sawers; and the same may be said of Mr. Bancroft himself. We would rather undertake to make converts to our own views concerning the means of elevating the laboring classes, in Beacon street, than in Broad street. The multitude applauded the condemnation of Socrates, they shouted "crucify him, crucify him," when Jesus was brought before Pilate, and they were foremost to imbrue their hands in the blood of Saint Bartholemew's Night. The people are always saved by the few whom they at first persecute, and afterwards deify. This always has been, and always must be the case. We say it not, in the spirit of railing against the people, but because it is true; and to show the folly of attempting to deify the people as a collective body. Our own devotion to the rights and interests of the people, we have no ocasion to proclaim; our whole life speaks, or may speak for us. But if we found the people so wise, so virtuous, so intelligent, we should see nothing for us to do by way of reform. And then how happens it, that this wise, intelligent, virtuous people, whose voice is the voice of God, submits for so many ages to such universal misrule and oppression?

But we are taking perhaps greater liberties than become us. We have indicated two tendencies in Mr. Bancroft's general principles which we regret, because they are tendencies which in a community like ours are dangerous. The man here who seeks to extend democracy, except in favor of the citizen, and who puffs up the people with the notion, that they can do no wrong, or who does nothing but praise them, is consciously, or unconsciously, paving the way for an order of things which will prove the destruction of all true liberty. We honor Mr. Bancroft's democratic zeal, we honor his love of the people, and we doubt not his moral power to suffer martyrdom in the cause of freedom; but at the same time we feel that he is laboring for an absolute democracy, without check or balance, except the virtue and intelligence of the people. Against such a government we have ever warred; and we took occasion in the very first number of this Journal to utter our loud and indignant protest. We are as much opposed to monarchy, and to aristocracy, as Mr. Bancroft is, and we are also opposed to all unlimited governments.

But after all, these tendencies are but slightly observable in Mr. Bancroft's History, and are perhaps implied, unconsciously to himself. We ourselves might not have noticed them, had we not found them always manifesting themselves in all his political speeches and addresses. But with the faults we have found with it, we still pronounce his history a marvellous production, and for its general accuracy and fidelity worthy of the highest confidence. We know no historical work in our language that can rank above it. It is worthy of its author and of his country.

The abridgment of the History now before us, though it offers no substitute for the larger work, is still a very full and interesting His-

tory of the colonization of the United States, admirably adapted to the use of Schools, and to the younger members of the community. We are glad to perceive that in abridging his work, the author has not so diluted the thoughts as to render it valueless. He seems not to have acted on the Peter Parley theory of adapting the thought and expression to the capacity of the child, and therefore preventing the child's capacity from ever enlarging. The child should always be required to read that which tasks the mind, and demands an effort to be understood. The Peter Parley theory has produced a series of children's books, which our grand juries should take the earliest opportunity of presenting as a nuisance. As a father we call upon them to do it. Mr. Bancroft is no Peter Parley. He gives us a book which our children will profit by reading, and which cannot be read without generating habits of thought and reflection. In the name of the fathers of the country we thank him. We are grateful always to the man who furnishes us a book, suitable to be put into the hands of our children. He confers a public blessing, and the warm, fresh hearts of the young will bless him; and we much mistake Mr. Bancroft, if he would not delight in the sunny smile and gushing love of youth, still more than in the approbation and applause of the old.

We conclude, by saying that we wait impatiently for the forthcoming History of the Revolution, a History to which the three volumes we have had are but an introduction. In these we see Liberty clearing away the forests, and erecting her dwellings; we are now to see her on the battle field. The world looks on. Let the bugles sound the charge. — Ed.

Art. VII. — LITERARY NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

1. *Hyperion, a Romance.* By H. W. Longfellow. New York: S. Colman. 1840. 2 vols. 12mo. 2. *Voices of the Night.* By H. W. Longfellow. Cambridge: John Owen. Fifth edition. 1841. 16mo. pp. 144. — We have been for sometime seeking an opportunity to express our opinion of these works by Professor Longfellow. Of the poems we need say nothing more than to mention the fact that the public buys and reads them. Poetry which lies on the booksellers' shelves is not worth much. All true poetry has readers, and that which has readers, always has some of the elements of true poetry. These Voices of the Night are calm, and sweet, and voices which bring a soft, silent echo from our hearts. The author in them, perhaps, does not prove that he possesses the poetical talent in the highest degree; but he does prove that he possesses genuine poetic feeling, and that in no common degree.

Hyperion was noticed sometime since in this Journal, by one of our contributors, in whose taste and judgment we have the greatest confidence. At that time we had not ourselves read the book. We have since read it, and we owe it to the author, to say, that we by no means endorse the criticism of our correspondent. Faultless the work is not; but we have read it with much satisfaction. Its tone is moral and elevated, and its thought, if not always the profoundest, is in general just and true. It is marked by great simplicity, purity, and depth of feeling. It is just one of those books we like, when we would relax ourselves from our severer studies, and recall some of those feelings, we had when we first discovered that the sentiment of the ME, if we may borrow an expression from a French philosopher, was insufficient, and that it must lose itself in the sentiment of the US. Those holidays of the heart come but once in a man's life, but the memory of them remains ever; and it is always grateful to meet with a book that recalls them, and places us again at full length under the old beechen tree, lost between thought and feeling, all too blest in the mysterious luxury of our own vague and indefinable sentiments. There is, we apprehend, a cord in all men's hearts that will vibrate at the touch of Hyperion, and we envy not the soul that will not, like Memnon's statue of old, discourse sweet melody at his approach.

Fault is found with Mr. Longfellow for naming his Romance, Hyperion. We hold a man has the right to name his literary or other offspring as he pleases. He may have reasons that we see not, and which he chooses not to disclose. It is enough for us that his offspring pleases us. And we cannot but add if Old Cambridge will never send out anything more objectionable than Hyperion, we shall come ultimately to regard her with a good degree of kindness, and even respect. By the by, we are inclined to think opposition to Cambridge may be carried a little too far. It is hardly just for men, who claim to be the friends of free thought, to condemn the only respectable Institution in the country, free from sectarian rule. True, we wish old Harvard would throw aside a few of her aristocratic airs, and conform more to the liberal spirit — we were about to say of the age, but we check ourselves, and add, — of the Boston Quarterly Review. But with all her aristocracy, we should like to know what institution in our country sends out freer, bolder, or more liberal scholars? After all, Old Harvard! we fancy that we reformers owe thee more than we care to tell, and we will say, God's blessing on thee.

The Methodist Quarterly Review, Vol. I. Nos. 1, 2. 8vo. New York. — This Review contained an article in its January number, reflecting very severely upon ourselves, and most grossly misconceiving and misrepresenting our views. Among other things it charged us with contending, that all laws on matrimony should be abolished. Holding as we do the marriage institution sacred, and regarding the family as the social unit, we wrote the editor, requesting him to correct the mistake into which he had fallen; which he

promised us he would do, by inserting in his April Number our letter contradicting the charge. But not having room to insert the Letter itself, he undertook to give its substance. In doing this, he fell into another mistake, and presented us to his readers, not as denying the marriage institution, but as denying its religious character, — as holding it to be a civil contract rather than a sacrament. We trust the very able and pious editor will do us the justice to tell his readers, what he is now aware is the fact stated in our Letter to him, that we *do* hold marriage to be a religious institution — a sacrament rather than a civil contract, and that it is in so holding, that we differ, if we differ at all on this subject, from our countrymen generally.

Of the Methodist Quarterly Review itself we can speak very highly. It is conducted with spirit, ability, and liberality, and we are pleased to find our Methodist friends sustaining a journal of so much positive merit. It may one day or other change its opinion of the Boston Quarterly. The original spirit of Methodism is a spirit with which we have great sympathy, and are always happy to meet it. We owe the principal part of our own early religious education to the Methodists.

The Philosophy of Storms. By James P. Espy, A. M. Boston: Little & Brown. 1841. 8vo. pp. 552. — Mr. Espy has been laughed at by many, and supposed by some to be a mere visionary, like a dreamer of a perpetual motion, or the philosopher's stone. The public at large think of him mainly as a sort of madman, who fancies that he can produce artificial rain. But whoso listens to his Lectures, or reads the work before us, will want no arguments to prove that he is a man of genuine science, and perhaps the greatest meteorologist living. We listened to two of his Lectures in this city, in which he developed the principles of his theory, with intense interest, and received from them much instruction, for which we thank him. We have read his Book, at least so much as concerns his principles, with great satisfaction. We are no meteorologist; indeed, we make no profession of acquaintance with the physical sciences. But we can understand a theory when developed, and judge whether the facts adduced sustain it, or not. We have not had time since this book was put into our hands to study it as closely, or to investigate the subject as thoroughly as we could wish; but we can say, that the theory strikes us as sound, and as being abundantly sustained by facts, in all its principal features.

We cannot within our present limits undertake to give even the outlines of the theory advanced. We shall however attempt to do it, at an early day, and also to state some few difficulties in regard to some few points, which we now feel, unless we shall be able in the mean time to remove them. The work is written with a good deal of ability, and indicates a mind of a high order. The principles are stated with great simplicity and clearness, and the reasoning is close, logical, pointed, and conclusive. We were glad to witness the manner in which the author uses up the New Haven Professor, for we have long had as poor an opinion of New Haven science, as

of New Haven Divinity, neither of which can satisfy a mind, blessed with even a tolerable logical capacity. Professor Olmstead may invent very convenient stoves, but Mr. Espy proves very clearly, that he is no meteorologist.

We conclude our brief notice with expressing our thanks to Mr. Espy for his work, the unwearied industry he manifests in collecting facts, and the science he displays in explaining them, and with subjoining the conclusion of the Report of the French Academy of Sciences, drawn up by Messrs. Arago, Pouillet, and Babinet, and which, as coming from the most scientific body in the world, ought to be entitled to some weight with our countrymen.

"In conclusion, Mr. Espy's communication contains a great number of well-observed and well-described facts. His theory, in the present state of science, alone accounts for the phenomena, and, when completed, as Mr. Espy intends, by the study of the action of electricity, when it intervenes, will leave nothing to be desired. In a word, for physical geography, agriculture, navigation, and meteorology, it gives us new explanations, indications useful for ulterior researches, and redresses many accredited errors.

"The committee expresses then the wish, that Mr. Epsy should be placed by the government of the United States in a position to continue his important investigations, and to complete his theory, already so remarkable, by means of all the observations and all experiments, which the deductions even of his theory may suggest to him, in a vast country, where enlightened men are not wanting to science, and which is besides, as it were, the home of these fearful meteors.

"The work of Mr. Espy causes us to feel the necessity of undertaking a retrospective examination of the numerous documents already collected in Europe, to arrange them and draw from them deductions which they can furnish, and more especially at the present period, when the diluvial rains, which have ravaged the south-east of France, have directed attention to all the possible causes of similar phenomena. Consequently, the committee proposes to the Academy to give its approbation to the labors of Mr. Espy, and to solicit him to continue his researches, and especially to try to ascertain the influence which electricity exerts in these great phenomena, of which a complete theory will be one of the most precious acquisitions of modern science."

Facts of Mesmerism, or Animal Magnetism. With Reasons for dispassionate Inquiry into it. By the Rev. CHAUNCY HARE TOWNSEND, A. M., late of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. First American Edition. With an Appendix, by ROBERT H. COLLYER, Member of the Massachusetts Medical Society, &c. &c. Boston: Little and Brown. 1841. 12mo. pp. 539.—The title of this book is somewhat clumsy and pedantic, partaking, we presume, in part of the taste of the American Editor; but the work itself is beautifully printed, and does great credit to the respectable and enterprising publishers, whose publications are always sent out in a style that it does a lover of books good to witness.

We cannot speak particularly of the merits of this book, for we

confess that we have only looked over its pages, and we never suffer ourselves to express a decided opinion of a work which we have not read with attention. We may say, however, that the book is in high repute with the believers in Animal Magnetism, and is probably the most authoritative, as well as interesting, work on the subject within the reach of the English reader.

Of Animal Magnetism itself we have now no room to speak at large. We have some notions on the subject, which we hope to find ere long an opportunity of bringing out, for it is a subject which we have investigated at some length. In regard to it there are some three questions to be asked and answered. 1. Are the facts alleged by magnetizers, really facts? 2. Admitting them to be facts, are they reducible to any *known* law of human nature? 3. Admitting they are not thus reducible, do they enable us to recognise and establish a new law? The first question we answer without any hesitation in the affirmative. The facts, or a class of facts corresponding to those alleged, are sufficiently attested. We have seen and experimented enough ourselves to have no doubt on that point. Collusion, quackery, scoundrelism, there often may be; but enough is established to enable us to assert the reality of the Mesmeric order of facts.

The third question we also answer without any hesitation. The facts do not as yet warrant the assertion of any law of human nature hitherto unadmitted, although they may lead to the suspicion of some law not generally recognised. But for ourselves, we are as yet disposed to believe them all reducible to well known and generally admitted laws of human nature, and therefore, after all, as nothing very wonderful. But, we own, that we have not as yet fully succeeded in making out this reduction. The only doubt, then, in our mind is, whether we can so reduce them, or whether we must admit a new law to account for them. Our doubt is not as to the facts, but as to the true science of the facts.

In the mean time, we shall probably find something to aid us in the book before us, which we commend to all inquirers, but not without protesting with all our energy against the practice of animal magnetists perambulating the country, exhibiting to gaping audiences their previously prepared *subjects.*

The Book of the Indians; or Biography and History of the Indians of North America, from its first discovery to the year 1841. By S. G. Drake. Eighth Edition, with large additions and corrections. Boston: Antiquarian Bookstore, 56 Cornhill. 1841. 8vo. pp. 708.—We must take another occasion to speak of this book as it deserves. All we can say now is, that Mr. Drake treats his subject *con amore.* He loves the Indians, and with unwearied diligence and industry, he has brought together here probably a greater mass of fact, concerning the Indians of North America than can anywhere else be found. Those who take an interest in the Aborigines of this country, and are desirous of collecting all that can be known respecting them, will find this Book of the Indians, the very book they want.

Confessions of an English Opium Eater. Being an extract from the Life of a Scholar. From the last London Edition. Boston: William D. Ticknor. 1841. 16mo. pp. 190. — This work is very neatly got up, and is withal an interesting book. We suppose we ought to know something about it, but we only know that we have often heard it spoken of, and alluded to, as a remarkable book, and we have found it quite readable. We have certain vague impressions about its author, but, Reviewers as we are, and therefore expected to know all things, we must confess ignorance, and acknowledge, who Mr. De Quincy was or is, we know not, at this present.

The Science of Government founded on Natural Law. By Clinton Roosevelt. New-York: Dean & Trevett. 1841. 18mo. pp. 113.—We have come to the conclusion, that if the world is not, as one of our friends hints, a great blunder, it is at least a great blunderer. Here we have been berated all over the country as the very *ne plus ultra* of a Radical. Mistake, all a mistake. If the world would only take note of one half of the projects communicated to us from reformers at home and abroad, during the last few months, it would do nothing but rail at us for our conservatism. We are after all but a fool of a radical, comparatively speaking as good as no radical at all; and if the world read the productions of others as attentively as it does ours, the fact would be admitted. *Aut Cæsar, aut nullus*, was our motto when a boy, and since we cannot be the wildest of Radicals, we have serious thoughts of trying our hand at being the staunchest of Conservatives.

Seriously, however, in this matter of world-reforming, it is our misfortune to differ from our Radical brethren. The reforms, which can be introduced in any one country, are predetermined by its geographical position, the productions of its soil, the genius of its people, and of its existing institutions. Any reform, which requires either the introduction or the destruction of a fundamental principle, is precluded. All reforms must consist in, and are necessarily limited to, clearing away anomalies, and developing already admitted principles.

Mr. Roosevelt's book, however, is serious and honest and able; it shows a thinking mind and a benevolent heart, and we wish everybody would read it.

An Exegesis of English Syntax. By James Brown. Philadelphia: Kay & Brother. 1840. 12mo. pp. 147. — Here is a new System of English Grammar, with an entire new terminology, by a man, who, notwithstanding a spice of the quack, has really made Grammar a study, and who has really studied it with some success. Mr. Brown has devoted some thirty years to the construction of his new system, and we do not hesitate to say, that he has constructed a system which has many advantages over the old. The old system classes words according, or professes to class words according to the nature of the things for which they stand. Mr. Brown's system

classes them according to the offices they perform in the construction of a sentence. By so doing he makes grammar treat merely of the mechanism of the language, brings it within a narrow compass, simplifies it, and renders it easily attainable. From the limited examination we have made of his system, we think it worthy of serious attention, by all who would become able to speak or write the English language correctly. Of his new terminology we are not as yet prepared to express our opinion. Every grammar-master, however, should procure and study the book.

*** This number closes the fourth year of the existence of this Journal, and we are happy to announce to its friends, somewhat more numerous than they were, that we are very well satisfied with the success of our experiment. We are satisfied that the public demand, and will sustain just such a Journal as ours has been. Our subscription list has much increased during the current year, and we shall commence our next volume with a larger edition. We cannot but congratulate ourselves, while we feel grateful to our countrymen, that we have been able to sustain ourselves so long, considering that for the greater part of the time we have been obliged, as it were, to labor single-handed, and alone. But the world after all has some redeeming traits, and though it now and then boxes our ears somewhat rudely, we are in no bad humor with it; for we apprehend, that in the game of blow for blow, we have not been the Friar Tuck. And especially do we feel in good humor with our own immediate community. We stated in the first number that in Boston we should find our warmest and best friends, and it has been so, notwithstanding New York, Philadelphia, and St. Louis, have treated us well. After all the grumbling about Boston and its vicinity, it is here that we find the freest, and most liberal and earnest-minded community on earth. We came here a few years since, a stranger, and we have been treated at times rudely enough; but every year endears us to the place and the people; and we have come to feel, that we are at home and in the midst of our friends.